

## PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND CHRISTIAN MORALITY

THE Psycho-Analytic cult has quite recently attracted the attention and aroused the interest of the public. In the medical and psychological world it has won for itself a position of unquestionable importance. It has developed rapidly during the last decade, and lays claim to astonishing achievements. Its ramifications are amazing and bewildering. In Pedagogy, Ethnology, Æsthetics, Literature, Psychology, and Therapeutics, new methods and new investigations have been pursued in the light of its assumed discoveries. So remarkable are its therapeutic bearings that many able physicians have devoted themselves exclusively to applying its methods in the treatment of hysterias and neuroses, believing, as they do, that Psycho-Analysis "has supplied us with an elaborate theory of the modes by which *ideas* are converted into *diseases*."<sup>1</sup> Needless to say, an enormous bibliography has sprung up around it, and while lavish praise is bestowed on it, and fantastic claims on its behalf are made by its exponents, not a small amount of bitter criticism is directed against it by unsympathetic psychologists and physicians.

Whatever the merits or defects or dangers of the new science may be, it is certainly now in process of "vulgarization," judging by the space given to it in the daily press, and in view of that fact, it is high time that it should be examined from a Catholic standpoint. Catholic doctors apply its methods, Catholic patients undergo its treatment, perhaps with some uneasiness of conscience. Catholic teachers, too, are hearing and reading of changes of method suggested by Psycho-Analysts, and are asking themselves how far such changes are desirable or well-grounded.

In the present paper we propose to give a brief outline of the new science and the new therapeutic treatment. We speak, of course, of honourable, reputable Psycho-Analysis,

<sup>1</sup> *Man's Unconscious Conflict*, by W. Lay, p. 254.

not of such as is practised by charlatans and quacks. As regards criticism, we shall content ourselves with briefly indicating some of its defects and dangers, and pointing out the extravagance of some of its claims.

The origin of Psycho-Analysis is usually traced to the investigations on hysteria conducted by J. M. Charcot, the famous director of the Salpêtrière. His method was mainly hypnotic. He made a minute examination of hysterical symptoms, especially of hysterical paralysis (traumatic paralysis<sup>1</sup>) which appears after severe emotional shocks. He found this symptom to be connected with ideas which controlled the mind of the patient in moments of special dispositions. The motor disturbances, characterizing the hysteria, he found to be reproducible by hypnotism, or even by suggestion, the suggested idea being followed by the hysterical symptom. One of Charcot's pupils, Pierre Janet, next made an important discovery. He cured a case of complicated traumatic hysteria by taking the patient in hypnosis back to the time when the shock was received, and suggesting that the shock was harmless.<sup>2</sup> At once all the painful hysterical symptoms disappeared. The method of Janet, however, failed to win its place as a regular method of treatment. Following Janet's success, Josef Breuer, a doctor of Vienna, made, accidentally, a discovery which was momentous in the development of Psycho-Analysis.

It happened that Breuer was treating an hysterical girl by hypnotism. He detected, during her hypnotic talk, references to some painful experience in early life of which, in conscious moments, she had no recollection. He began to make to her, when awake, some allusions to the experience which she had spoken of under hypnotism, and succeeded in eliciting from her, bit by bit, the whole story. "It showed that the scattered words were like the flag appearing above a wall behind which was marching a body of troops bearing it."<sup>3</sup> When the whole story of the experience was brought back to the girl's memory, and when she was able to repeat it, as she did, with appropriate emotional expression, health was restored. She had re-lived the experience, and, so to

<sup>1</sup> Trauma is a term constantly applied to mind-wounds of various kinds by psycho-analysts.

<sup>2</sup> See the history of the famous case of "Marie" in Pfister, "*The Psycho-Analytic Method*, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

speak, worked off the pent-up *affect*.<sup>1</sup> She had "talked it" out or off, and so the hidden trouble faded away naturally. In technical language, the experience was *ab-reacted*. The cure was effected by bringing back to consciousness the circumstances of the trauma and the accompanying emotions and allowing the experience to subside normally. This method of treatment became known as the *cathartic*<sup>2</sup> method—and it is still used. It differed from Janet's method in laying emphasis on the finding and bringing to light of a hidden trouble long lost to the patient's conscious memory.

Sigmund Freud, who worked at first with Breuer, now became the great pioneer and expounder of Psycho-Analysis. He dispensed to a great extent with hypnosis and suggestion, and relying almost entirely on the study of the manifestations of the sub-conscious, he added enormously to the existing theory by his investigations. His first works on hysteria appeared in 1893 and 1895, which were followed in 1900 and 1901 by his important works on *Dreams* and *Psycho-pathology of Everyday Life*. Unwearied in writing and investigating, he has come to be regarded as the Father of Psycho-Analysis, though many of his personal views no longer find general support. Many points of divergence have recently split psycho-analysts into different schools, of which perhaps the three most important are those of Freud, Jung and Adler. Into these points of divergence, however, it is not necessary to enter.

Psycho-Analysis is in a sense the *science of the unconscious*, aiming, as Ernest Jones,<sup>3</sup> a prominent analyst, writes, "at setting free the unconscious with a view to the discovery and comprehension of the patient's buried complexes," or, according to Barbara Low, "at investigating the content and working of the unconscious mind and the relations between the conscious and the unconscious."<sup>4</sup> It may be well, then, before giving a more formal definition of this science, to explain what psycho-analysts mean by the *unconscious* and to record what they say of it.

Psycho-analysts find in the mind two activities, or rather two aspects of the one mind-activity, the conscious and the unconscious. Part of our past experience is actually present

<sup>1</sup> Feeling or emotion connected with and accompanying an idea or experience.

<sup>2</sup> καθαίρειν = to purify.

<sup>3</sup> *Papers on Psycho-Analysis*, by Ernest Jones, p. 131.

<sup>4</sup> *Psycho-Analysis*, by Barbara Low, p. 24.

in consciousness; part is not present in consciousness, it is the *unconscious*. Of the store of past experience not present to consciousness, part is recallable at will, which part is called the *preconscious*, or *recallable mind-stuff*; other part is not recallable at will, it is the *true unconscious* or the *subconscious*.<sup>1</sup> Although we are not aware of the contents of the unconscious, we are influenced by it in all our activities. No experience through which we have passed is lost to us; all is stored in the mind's mysterious, unseen safe. "In the unconscious," writes Freud, "there is no ending, no past, no forgetting." The unconscious is ever at work, but it makes little noise with its tools, and allows but little of its possessions to escape. And yet, say the analysts, it does allow a little of its store to escape, and at times makes a little noise with its tools. For in dreams, in delirious ravings, in impulsive acts, in sudden forgettings or rememberings or recognitions or slips of the tongue, in hesitations at times, and strange embarrassments, in passionate outbursts and inexplicable likes or dislikes, in unaccountable intuitions and emotions, we have, they affirm, *leakings* from the unconscious. Sometimes they point to indications of an *unconscious will*, in choices or decisions, working against the conscious; sometimes they attribute the forgetting of disagreeable or painful incidents to unconscious but, in a sense, purposeful *repression* or *suppression*<sup>2</sup>; sometimes they adduce instances of important mental work (for instance, the solution of mathematical problems), done by the mind during sleep or while the conscious mind is busily occupied with something else.

The unconscious [writes Freud] is the larger circle which includes within itself the smaller circle of the conscious. Everything conscious has its preliminary step in the unconscious, whereas the unconscious may stop with this step and still claim full value as a physical activity. Properly speaking the unconscious is the real psychic; its inner nature is just as unknown to us as the reality of the external world, and it is just as imperfectly reported to us through the data of consciousness, as is the external world through the indications of our sensory organs.<sup>3</sup>

A striking illustration of the unfelt influence of the uncon-

<sup>1</sup> Freud distinguishes conscious, preconscious, sub-conscious, and unconscious, but the latter two terms are used by other writers synonymously.

<sup>2</sup> These terms are usually used synonymously for the act of *driving an experience or emotion into the unconscious*.

<sup>3</sup> *Interpretation of Dreams*, p. 486.

scious, adduced by analysts, is taken from a common hypnotic experiment. A person under hypnosis is instructed to take up a chair and place it on a table as soon as he hears the sound of a bell. He is then awakened from his hypnotic sleep, and has no recollection of the command he received. Soon afterwards the bell is rung, and he at once takes up a chair and places it on a table. When questioned as to the reason for his strange conduct, he proceeds to give reasons which have nothing in common with the real cause of his action, of which he is quite unconscious. In a similar way, Freud asserts, many of our apparently deliberate acts are performed under the influence of sub-conscious motives entirely unsuspected by us.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed on the fact that the real causes of what we do in our acts from hour to hour are hidden from us, and that the majority of assigned reasons are mere pretexts, the real motives being in the unconscious, and therefore absolutely inaccessible to us.<sup>1</sup>

It may not be out of place to pause for a moment at this characteristic example of the slovenly thinking of many exponents of the new psychology. On the basis of a few instances, of half-understood psychical abnormalities, they are ready to rush to some rash generalization utterly opposed to the common sense of mankind, and the accepted principles of sane psychology. Because a patient, recently aroused from hypnotic sleep, and still under the influence of suggestion (and even possibly still in a hypnoidal condition), is unable to account for an act which he performs, are we to conclude that "the real causes of what we do . . . are hidden from us and . . . the real motives are in the unconscious"? While we admit that it is difficult to define fully and precisely our motives for our choices and decisions, we fail to see any serious grounds for the rash generalization recorded above. Such slovenly thinking naturally brings discredit on the new psychology.

For Freudians the unconscious is not merely a store-house, but it is also a prison, and a hospital. Painful and terrifying experiences; brutal anti-social instincts; mind-wounds and soul-wounds of various kinds are driven down into it, or *repressed*. There they are held in bonds, often, however, they drag at their chains, or like primæval dragons "tear each

<sup>1</sup> *Man's Unconscious Conflict*, by W. Lay, p. 16.

other in the slime." They give rise, at times, to those agonizing mental conflicts which translate themselves externally into nervous or hysterical symptoms. "Buried complexes," such sources of trouble are called—but we cannot here do more than allude to them. It is the aim of the analyst to search for them in the unconscious, to discover their nature and to rob them of their power of upsetting the peace of the conscious mind.

To sum up Freud's doctrine of the unconscious—using his own words:

There is no chance in the psychic world any more than in the physical. What look like accidental happenings are not so in reality. Impulsive acts, nervous physical movements, hysterical paralyses, phobias and obsessions, have all some counterpart in the unconscious. "An idea has been converted into a disease." A large part of our psychic life remains and operates in the unconscious. We see only end-results which appear detached, incongruous, causeless. But unconscious and conscious mind are but two aspects of one entity, one inconceivable without the other; both acting and reacting uninterruptedly throughout life.

Having explained to some extent the doctrine of the unconscious, it may be well now to give a definition of Psycho-Analysis. It aims at a "further understanding and a further harmonizing of the various elements of the psychic life." The term "Psycho-Analysis" comprises both *the theory* of the unconscious mind with its methods of working, and *a technique* whereby that unconscious mind can be explored or interpreted. Oskar Pfister, in his important work, *The Psycho-Analytic Method*, gives perhaps the best general definition:

Psycho-analysis is a scientifically grounded method devoted to neurotic and mentally deranged persons, as well as to normal individuals, which seeks by the collection and interpretation of associations, with the avoidance of suggestion and hypnosis,<sup>1</sup> to investigate and influence the instinctive forces and content of mental life lying below the threshold of consciousness.

The investigation of "*instinctive forces*," referred to in this definition, may be regarded as the central fact of Freudian psychology. For Freud, the basal instincts of man are the primitive brutal tendencies, inherited from our supposed pre-

<sup>1</sup> Some analysts use hypnotism, some do not. It is safe to say that most use it still.

historic savage ancestors, which, untamed and violent, still exist like cave-dwellers in our unconscious. Freud selects one instinct as predominant and fundamental, and calls it *libido*, emphasizing, as is well known, its sexual character. Putnam and other analysts call it "craving," Jung names it "*horme*," Bergson would perhaps have regarded it as the *élan vital*. It connotes that craving for life, love and action which modern psychologists deal with so largely.

The primitive instincts are of course anti-social and egotistic. They possess energy which seeks realization in a pleasurable outlet. They resist restraint and repression, although, as we shall see, they submit to *sublimation*, or, in other words, may be at times directed into useful social channels of activity. Ultimately they are the cause of all mental conflicts. According to Freud, in early life instinct is wholly unchecked and dominates us, contented in the satisfaction of its cravings. But, as we grow, and come up against reality, and have to conform to conventions, and the exterior conditions of life, the *libido* has to be checked and repressed, or, if possible, sublimated. The agency by which repression is carried out he calls the *Censor*. The *Censor*, as it were, stands on the bridge between the conscious and the unconscious suppressing primitive tendencies which would run counter to the taboos of Society. "Censorship," writes Ernest Jones, "is the sum total of repressing inhibitions." Not only when we are awake, but also when we are asleep, the *Censor* is active, keeping out of dreams as far as possible what would shock our acquired social sense.

The primitive instincts may, however, say the analysts, be too severely repressed, and, unless a suitable sublimation for them is found, a *complex*, that is, the mental counterpart of an hysteria, is likely to occur.

A complex [writes Freud] results from a damming of psychical energy, accompanying the profound primitive impulses which remain undischarged owing to the checks imposed by the sublimating forces.

The young male loves to fight; he has an aggressive fighting instinct; but this instinct is repressed. It still lives in his unconscious, seeking an outlet, a discharge of its energy. Later on he plays games, and takes his place in the battle of life. Thereupon he finds a means of discharging the energy of his primitive fighting instinct—he finds a sublima-

tion that is social. He adjusts himself to reality, and no neurosis results. Whereas, had he never found a means of discharging that energy by an appropriate sublimation, he might have become either a murderer or a neurasthenic.

Freud, as we have said, emphasized, in an altogether extravagant way, the sexual character of man's primitive instincts, and found in their non-fulfilment or non-sublimation the most potent and common cause of complexes and hysterias. He saw in art and poetry, amongst other things, a sublimation for the sexual instinct. And, to give an example, what he describes as the *Exhibitionist* sexual instinct in the child, he finds sublimated in later life in the love of gaudy attire; of appearing in public, on stage or platform; in fine, in all the activities of publicity-hunters.

As regards Freud's doctrine of the nature and activities of the *libido*, our criticism may be brief. The passions and emotions were studied and analysed long ago by moralists, and the struggle between "the law of the members" and "the law of the mind" is known to all. A few terms, some useful, some useless, have been found to describe activities long since understood. The *Censor*, e.g., describes the work of conscience and good habits. *Sublimation* describes the work of moral education. The *complex* is the evil passion, with its latent associations and physiological components, that is kept in check, but is always a potential source of trouble. The part which the animal within us takes in all that we say or do or desire or think has always been admitted by scholastic psychologists. We act and must act according to our nature, and our nature is at once animal and spiritual, a duality. Our acts are never wholly animal nor wholly spiritual. *Actio sequitur esse*. The "clay of which we are formed" stains, materially at least, even our highest and noblest acts and words and thoughts. Much Freudian "discovery" is to be found in the writings of Aristotle and St. Thomas, and, as far as rational psychology goes, we refuse to admit that Freud has added anything to human knowledge. But, nevertheless, we readily admit the value of his research work. He and his followers have gathered together, classified and analysed with skill, a vast amount of matter bearing on the concrete working of the mind, whether normal or abnormal. They have shown themselves useful and industrious workers in empirical psychology, the psychology of observation and experiment. As rational or metaphysical psychologists they have no merit,

and probably they have no ambitions in that line, though frequently, with unbecoming levity, they scoff at truths, without showing that they grasp or understand them.

We turn now to the Freudian doctrine of dreams, which, were it not marred by the Freudian obsession for sexuality, would have merited much praise. At the hands of saner psycho-analysts it presents a fascinating and instructive study, and we confess that they make out a very strong case for their theory that "in the interpretation of dreams we have the *via regia* to the knowledge of the unconscious."

For "the man in the street" a dream is "all nonsense," a mere juxtaposition of incongruous, bizarre images, with no significance behind them. But for the psycho-analyst,<sup>1</sup> "Far from being nonsensical, the dream has been shown to be incapable of either nonsense or untruth, if the symbolic language in which it is necessarily expressed is rightly understood and translated into the language of conscious life."

The study of dreams has played, and plays, a large rôle in Psycho-Analysis, so much so that it is regarded as an "invaluable aid,"<sup>2</sup> without which "in most cases Psycho-Analysis could not be carried out at all thoroughly."<sup>3</sup>

Dreams for the most part serve two purposes, the preservation of sleep, and the fulfilment of repressed or unattained wishes. "Every dream, expressing as it does an unconscious wish on the part of the dreamer, is a very important part of him."<sup>4</sup> "A dream is not interpreted until this wish is discovered."<sup>5</sup> All analysts seem to agree that the dream is a wish-fulfilment, however much disguised, and that the discovery of the hidden wish gives an important clue to the secrets of the unconscious. But how is the hidden wish to be discovered?

In the dream, the figures, scenes, and actions that we behold are the *manifest* content. They represent the symbolic side of the dream. But behind these symbols, as behind the figures in a cartoon, there is a meaning, the *latent* content, which the analyst seeks to discover. Often an apparently bizarre juxtaposition of quaint images tells the story of a hidden conflict of the unconscious. But what of the symbols,

<sup>1</sup> *Man's Unconscious Conflict*, by W. Lay, p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> *Elements of Practical Psycho-Analysis*, by Paul Bousfield, p. 105.

<sup>3</sup> *Man's Unconscious Conflict*, by W. Lay, p. 150.

<sup>4</sup> *Mind and its Disorders*, by W. H. B. Stoddart, p. 102.

are they entirely arbitrary? While analysts admit that much of the symbolism is arbitrary, and taken from some recent experience, perhaps of the previous day, they maintain, nevertheless, that some at least of dream-symbols are not arbitrary. They have a strange resemblance to the symbolism of the myths and legends of the human race. Indeed, in a sense, legends and fairy-tales are the dreams of the human race "expressing as they do the fulfilment of mankind's desire for happiness, and power, or compensating mankind for the many restrictions imposed upon it by man's own biological status."<sup>1</sup>

Psycho-analysts have a theory to explain the reason for symbolism on which it is not necessary to dwell. Briefly it is, that the dream wish, which is usually the yearning of the primitive instinct for some gratification, is often so crude, egotistic and anti-social, that the *Censor* would not allow it into consciousness were it not disguised, and so capable of escaping his vigilance, which is somewhat relaxed during sleep. Such a theory is picturesque perhaps, but wholly fanciful.

One important piece of evidence as to the existence of a "latent content" in dreams is found in the fact that "the emotions felt in a dream do not always correspond with actual happenings in the dream, but with ideas hidden behind them. Thus one may fall off a cliff in a dream without experiencing any fear because the symbolism of falling off a cliff in that particular dream represents nothing of a fearful nature; whereas one might strike a match in a dream and have intense terror from apparently unexplained reasons—the real reason, however, being that the terror referred, not to the striking of the match, but to the idea which that action disguised."<sup>2</sup>

Freud maintains that in dreams the work of the mind continues, without interruption, "what has occupied our minds during the day dominates our dream thoughts," and certainly it is remarkable how often we find problems solved and opinions modified and corrected after sleep. In sleep, too, long lost memories revive, "des souvenirs surgissent qui semblent effacés pour toujours"<sup>3</sup>; and primitive, instinctive tendencies often play havoc with the imagination, stealing, as Freudians would put it, in disguise, past the *Censor*, into the conscious fields of the dream, "tendances inférieures et

<sup>1</sup> *Psycho-Analysis*, by André Tridon, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> *Elements of Practical Psycho-Analysis*, by Paul Bousfield, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Éléments de Psychologie Expérimentale*, by Père de la Vaissière, p. 247.

brutales . . . sevèrement reprimées à l'état normal ne se heurtent pas pendant le sommeil à la même coercion."

Psycho-analysts use the method of "association" to find out the latent content of dreams. If, for instance, a "tower" or a "clock" appears in a dream, they get the subject to record in full what these words suggest to his mind or bring to his memory. Nevertheless, the task of interpretation is difficult and exceedingly delicate.

In addition to the study of night-dreams, some analysts study day-dreams, and even the imagery that crystal-gazing calls forth from the patient's imagination. Hypnotism; association tests, with or without the use of galvanometers; and free-associations are also employed by analysts in their search for the hidden trouble in the unconscious. They insist, also, on complete and open "manifestation of conscience" from their patients, the "*golden rule*" of which is (difficult though it must be at times for the patient) "*that in no case is the patient ever to withhold from the analyst any thought however painful or delicate.*"<sup>1</sup>

There is still another feature of the process which should be mentioned before concluding this brief account of the method of psycho-analysts. It is what is called "*transference.*" The analysis, as may be guessed, takes a very considerable time. "Even in the hands of the great masters of Psycho-Analysis the shortest cases take an hour a day for three months, and some take an hour a day for three years."<sup>2</sup> As the analysis proceeds the analyst gradually tries to win the sympathy and confidence of his patient, and finally to draw upon himself, the emotional component of the discovered complex. This is called *transference*, and is regarded by most analysts as of the highest importance, though they readily admit its danger. Transference, according to Ernest Jones, is "the displacement on to the physician of various affects (feelings) that really belong to some other person." When one considers what this means, in the light of what we have said about the intimate nature of the confidences exchanged between physician and patient, in daily tête-à-têtes, lasting an hour, many of them passed in discussing the aberrations of the patient's *libido*, we cannot be surprised at the outcry raised against this method as morally dangerous, especially when there is difference of sex between physician and patient.

<sup>1</sup> *Papers on Psycho-Analysis*, by Ernest Jones, p. 284.

<sup>2</sup> *The Mind and its Disorders*, by W. H. B. Stoddart, p. 183.

Having now given, as we proposed to do, a brief outline of the new science and the new therapeutic treatment, it is time to examine its merits and defects from the Catholic stand-point. We shall confine our criticism to three points, the pretensions of psycho-analysts, the morality of the psycho-analytic method of treatment, and the value of the psychology on which the method is based.

First, as regards the pretensions of psycho-analysts, of those, that is, as we have stated before, who are learned, skilful and conscientious, not of impostors and quacks, we are inclined to think that their claims are exaggerated. The method, after all, has nothing very original about it. It is a development, or rather, as we shall see, a perversion of the method of the spiritual guide who, after a prolonged study of moral pathology and much experience of the reaction between grace and nature, is in a position to help, console and comfort, according as he succeeds in winning the confidence, and learning the hidden trouble or grief of those who have recourse to him. He can often explain away fears and mild obsessions, and counteract by his counsels and encouragement evil tendencies and habits. As to what lies in the unconscious, the spiritual guide or confessor does not try to find that out by interpreting dreams or by free-associations,—methods which often prove futile and still more often deceptive, but, basing himself on a vast and varied experience of the human heart, he diagnoses the trouble of soul as a doctor does a disease of body. No! there is nothing very new in the method of Psycho-Analysis, but there is inherent weakness. This weakness reveals itself, not so much in not finding out the trouble as in not finding out the remedy. How can analysts face the reconstructive part of their work? On what have they to rely? The weak will of the moral degenerate has to be built up! How can this be done unless by the influence of religion? What have analysts to replace the Grace of God? No doubt they may find the cause or origin of the evil habit, for instance, of the unhappy drug-taker. They may, by getting him to *ab-react*, effect a temporary cure, and even banish for a time the obsession of mind. But his will is still weak. The craving will again be aroused. Unless he has the Cross to cling to, and the Bread of Life to eat, how can his weak will resist the re-aroused craving? Accordingly, though we do not deny that within a narrow range of hysterical cases, Psycho-Analysis scores at times dramatic successes, on the other hand, it often fails badly,

and as its exponents admit, does positive harm to the neurasthenic patient, instead of good. Its pretensions, then, are too high, and the fantastic and extravagant claims made in many of the works written by analysts are wholly unjustified by fact. In any case, as a method it demands from the patient a wholly preposterous expense of time—and *money*—given that the hopes it can hold out of a cure are so vague and uncertain.

As regards the morality of the method, we believe that its aim, viz., the discovery in the mind of a possible hidden source of trouble calculated to cause the neurosis, is quite lawful. It seems to us that *per se* the method of dream interpretation, free-association, hypnotism under proper safeguards, and even a mild form of "transference," is also legitimate. But, as to the *expediency* of submitting to this method, seeing the exceeding great moral danger involved, that is another question. In most cases where there is difference of sex between physician and patient, we believe it would be morally unjustifiable to undergo the treatment, such at least as it is described in the manuals of Psycho-Analysis, not on account of anything unlawful in the technique of the method, but because of the obvious moral danger involved. No doubt such danger can be lessened by accommodating the method to persons and circumstances, for certainly, the method is capable of accommodation. No doubt, also, the danger is less when the analysts resorted to are thoroughly trustworthy and conscientious. But the more one knows of Freudian psychology, the Freudian spirit, and the Freudian view of human nature, on which the Psycho-Analytic method is based, the more one is convinced of the immediate moral dangers involved in submitting to the method. The process is far more searching than is found in the practice of confession, whilst it is stripped of the many safeguards attached to the latter.

Lastly, what is the value of the New Psychology? How does it compare with Scholastic Psychology? Does it mark an advance of the Science of the Mind?

The new psychology, as we have already pointed out, is an empirical, observational and experimental psychology. *Per se* it does not clash in any way with the Scholastic Psychology which is rational and metaphysical. It merely supplies new matter, new observations, on which to reason. It is beyond its sphere to discuss the freedom of the will or the spirituality of the soul, although it often fails to confine itself to its

proper limits. Nevertheless, its value is considerable. A legitimate demand for a scientific psychology of primitive instincts exists. Nerve specialists, for instance, are in need of a scientific sex-psychology, as indeed are criminologists, educationalists and others. The new psychology tends to satisfy this requirement. Also, there is no doubt, that in its varied ramifications into ethnology, aesthetics, literature, and other sciences, it has supplied new points of view, and opened up new questions. It would be unfair to refuse to acknowledge the merit of the work done, or the value of the facts classified and analysed by the new psychologists—but it is of the spirit in which they do their work, the materialistic basis on which they support it, that we have reason to complain.

For instance, apparently *ex professo*, they drag into all their books painful illustrations of sex abnormalities. They write up, in the vernacular, in popular style, matters that hitherto were found only in technical treatises. They deliberately set themselves to propagate sex-knowledge, without weighing the consequences. Indeed, they well deserve the taunt of trying to secure big sales for their books, by appealing to the lower instincts of the public. In addition to this, in many of their works, there is a disgusting flippancy of tone in their allusions to ethical and religious truths. Their sex-obsession pursues them wherever they turn. Indeed, some exponents of Psycho-Analysis seem sex-mad, and sorely in need of treatment by their brother-analysts.

As a literature, Psycho-Analysis is on the whole poor stuff. It is neither thoughtful nor well-written, though it is replete with interesting matters of observation. The conclusions arrived at, and the general remarks about history, religion and philosophy, which we find in this literature, are often shallow, fanciful and hysterical. There is a marked lack of accurate and logical thinking, and a still more marked lack of reverence and respect for what is sacred—and all is written with a ludicrous air of superiority.

As a literature, Psycho-Analysis only serves to depress one with a renewed sense of the weakness of that human heart, the foibles and sins of which it glories in exposing.

I would not take the flowers of life, and tear them  
 Apart, their inner secrets all to view,  
 I'd pluck them gently, reverently wear them,  
 If I were you. (*Prevost.*)

E. BOYD BARRETT.

## THE STUDENT AND THE PRESS<sup>1</sup>

EN years ago, in his pamphlet on *The Apostolate of the Press*—a plea for better support for our Catholic newspapers—Father Charles Plater pointed out that our people get most of their information on the events of our time, on current controversies and on social questions, and the great movements of our day from the non-Catholic press. He argued that they are thus exposed to a steady infiltration of views and opinions which emanate from anti-Catholic or at least non-Catholic sources, and risk the loss of “that supernatural insight into the sanctity and glory of God’s Church, which should be one of our most cherished possessions”; and he asked: “What efforts are we making to fortify our people against the specious and insistent appeals of the secular press?”

It is a very practical question. At the present day the people of England—Catholics as well as non-Catholics—do far more newspaper reading than book reading. I have no precise statistics on the subject, but I believe that each year there is more reading matter produced in England in newspaper form than in book form. Amongst the centres of organized power and influence in England there are few, if any, that can rival the wonderful newspaper centre of London, a region of editorial offices and printing works extending along the river-side over the crowded half-mile from near Ludgate Circus to beyond Temple Bar. It is a place where work hardly ceases day or night all through the year, except for the brief pause at Christmas. Every night it turns out newspapers—the great dailies—in millions of copies, papers that circulate all over the country. For hours each afternoon and evening it is sending, by telegraph and telephone, news and views to the provincial press. From an early hour each morning till late in the afternoon it is sending out another flood of news and views in the evening papers. At each week-end there is a third flood—the Sunday and weekly papers. It has an army of thousands of workers, an aggregate capital of millions, a world-wide organization for the

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the Catholic Conference on Higher Studies at Cambridge in Christmas week.

collection and distribution of news. It prints each night enough reading matter to fill long rows of volumes if it were produced in book form. There are several daily papers that claim a circulation of over a million, that is to say, they produce more than 300 million copies each year. No wonder that wide forests are felled to be converted into wood-pulp to feed their presses.

And all these newspapers find eager readers. Very few books reach a really large circulation. Most of those now published have a first and final issue of from 1,000 to 1,500 copies. A fairly large number reach through a cheaper issue a circulation of twenty-five or thirty thousand. Any larger circulation is exceptional. If we except a few novels, I doubt if any book published in England in the last fifty years has ever approached a circulation of a million. Men may read books, but they are absolutely certain to read newspapers, and to read them every day of their lives. The newspaper press supplies in our day most of the reading for the people —for the uneducated, half-educated and educated alike.

And let it be noted that the newspaper does not supply a mere colourless record of news. Facts and fictions bearing on the events of the day are published so as to influence opinion. They are carefully selected, skilfully marshalled, and emphasized with a deliberate purpose by the boldly-displayed headline and the well-argued leading article or the brief explanatory comment. It is not only news that is dealt with. Religious, philosophical, scientific, historical, social topics are all handled. The newspaper reader gets his knowledge and his views on all the latest developments and activities in these various departments, largely, if not entirely, from his favourite daily paper. The average editor has a keen eye for the sensational, the unconventional, and even Conservative papers in the non-Catholic press, seem to be very "Liberal" in their views when they deal with the great questions of religious belief and the philosophy of human life.

Outside scholarly circles I doubt if many men in England have ever read a serious book on the "Higher Criticism" or a Modernist treatise. But they get their Higher Criticism and their Modernism in the newspaper, which tells them it is the verdict of the best and the most advanced among the leaders of modern thought.

For one man who has ever studied any scientific work on the evolution theory, there are a score who have got from

newspaper reviews and articles the fixed belief that the evolution theory, in its extreme rationalistic form, represents the demonstrated and generally accepted result of half a century of scientific research.

It is the newspaper, with its calm assumption of unerring knowledge, its sweeping statements on doctrinal, historical and social topics, statements made with an air of assurance that no educated man can think otherwise, and with constant reiteration of such statements, that helps to keep alive old prejudices against everything Catholic, and makes the average Englishman regard Catholicism as equivalent to obscurantism.

Most men read only one newspaper—they feel uncomfortable if they cannot get it, just as they dislike having to begin the day without their favourite breakfast dish. It gives them not only the news, but also ready-made views and opinions. Few even among educated men read critically, and, indeed, among the public at large, few have either the knowledge or the training that makes critical reading possible. So they accept almost passively what their favourite paper gives them. If some new view startles them at first sight, or suggests a contradiction, they feel as they read on that after all there is something to be said for it. They find great names—or what are presented as great names—put forward as authorities for it. It is carefully brought forward again and again at frequent intervals, and they get used to it. Of late, several of the newspapers have thus been indoctrinating the minds of many with erratic theories on birth control, divorce and spiritism.

The average newspaper reader has no idea of the forces at work behind his favourite paper, the sources of its information and inspiration, or the value of the opinions it quotes as authoritative. He is mentally at the mercy of the editor, leader writers, reporters, and reviewers of the paper he reads.

A Catholic has the protection and help of definite beliefs, fixed principles and recognized standards of right and wrong to guard him against this constant assertion or suggestion of falsehood; but it is certain that many Catholics are nevertheless unfavourably influenced by this anti-Christian or un-Christian propaganda. The influence is sometimes disastrous. There was less mischief done in the days of the crude, old-fashioned no-Popery press. The tone of the newspaper to-day is not openly hostile. It is largely indifferent,

sceptical and un-Christian. Tolerant and patronizing articles on some form of Catholic activity are as often as not inspired by mere indifference.

Now it is obvious that it would be a source of danger for Catholics to read regularly day by day books inspired by Indifferentism, Scepticism and Neo-Paganism. The situation is surely just as bad when the literature so read is not in book but in newspaper form. Yet under modern conditions newspaper reading has become practically a necessity of everyday life.

I suggest, therefore, that we may well try to find some means of forearming our educated young men and women, and of preparing them, during the later years of their studies, in some way that will safeguard them from being helplessly influenced by the newspapers they will read when they leave the college for their life work. I further suggest that it would be well worth while to give our clerical students and our teaching Sisters some definite knowledge and guidance that will prepare them for helping others in this matter.

I speak under readiness for correction when I say that, rightly or wrongly, my impression is that in our Catholic higher schools and seminaries there is a tendency to boycott the newspaper. I know of one house of studies where each Saturday a Catholic weekly paper makes its appearance, and a few other newspapers occasionally arrive. I remember how, when I was myself a student of Catholic philosophy, on one day only in a three years' course a newspaper made its appearance. It was an admirable course, but we heard of current objections and hostile theories chiefly in the form of brief summaries supplied by our professors in excellent Latin. Now and then we had a passage from some unorthodox British writer given to us in his own English. But on one day, which I even now remember as a day of special interest, the Professor of Moral Philosophy, who was then dealing with the question of property in land, produced a copy of that morning's *Times*, and read us a leading article on the Irish Land Question. By the way, he was an Englishman, and his comments did not even touch upon party politics. He analysed its argument, he exposed its fallacies, he called attention to the dexterous way in which they were disguised. I felt we were up against the real thing; we were dealing with no extract from a professorial treatise, but with the kind of talk

that was going on among men in the living world of our day, and learning something of the methods of current journalism. It was a most useful experience.

Now I know that the weeks and months of each year of study in school, college and seminary, are full up of work, so that anyone may well shrink from the suggestion that time should be found for any new subject.

But the incident I have related suggests that there is no need of giving the student anything like a course of journalism or of journalistic criticism. The protective, prophylactic treatment I have in mind might be secured by systematically using the newspapers, both Catholic and non-Catholic, as illustrative and auxiliary matter in the existing courses. It would surely be useful to show the student, not merely once in three years, how the machinery of misleading propaganda works, but to do it frequently, as the occasion offers—and the occasion can easily be found. Let us consider if it is not advisable and possible to give our students—laymen and clerics—a first contact with the un-Christian, anti-Christian and Neo-Pagan press propaganda of the day, when the antidote can be supplied in the form of expert criticism, instead of, as at present, largely leaving them to discover for themselves and feel the influence of this propaganda in their daily and weekly newspaper reading when their studies are over.

I can only indicate briefly what might be done. We teach history. Would it not be useful for the class teacher and the professor to take up, now and then, some of the current misrepresentations of history in the very form in which the press supplies them, point out misleading statements and arguments, and the anti-Catholic and anti-Christian assertions and assumptions that are so often heralded with some such preface as "It has long since been recognized that" or "as every expert on these matters is now aware."

In the same way, in the schools of philosophy and theology, there would be ample opportunity for bringing before the student examples of the current fallacies and fictions of the press on points of doctrine, morality and the rest. If I were a teacher dealing with the question of human testimony, I would consider I was doing a very practical work in showing how the press can become consciously or unconsciously the organ of false report.

And I would further suggest that it would be well worth while if time could be found for a few lectures on the news-

paper press and its methods generally. Literature—the literature to be found in books—is a recognized subject of study. The course might be expanded a little to find room for some teaching about the literature of the million, the literature of every day and every week that is to be found in the newspapers—the literature that now influences men's minds even more than books, the medium through which busy men imbibe the teaching of scores of books that they will never read.

A few years ago I gave a lecture on the newspaper press to the clerical students in one of our seminaries. One of the professors said to me after it: "I am glad you have done something to shake the confidence of our young men in the virtues of the daily press." We older men have learned by long experience a judicious scepticism about much that we read in its columns. We—or at least many amongst us—know how the big machine works, how, for instance, the chief of a newspaper trust, that combines many papers, can utter his solemn decree in one of them, and next day quote the same pronouncement from all the rest as proof that the great voice of public opinion is speaking on his side. We know how a newspaper here and there is quoted to prove that the opinion of a whole nation is deeply moved in this or that direction, when as a matter of fact the papers quoted speak, not for a whole people, but for a party or even for only a clique within a party. The young man does not know it.

Let me give some illustrations—we here in England ought to take some interest in the opinion of the largest English-speaking community in the world—the hundred millions of the United States, of whom probably at least twenty millions are our fellow-Catholics. When the London press gives us a sample of American opinion, it usually takes the form of a brief extract from the *New York Times*. I happen to be the correspondent of an American weekly review, and each week newspapers come to me from many parts of the United States. I find in them pronouncements of opinion on current questions so varied as to show that to quote any one of these papers as typical of American opinion generally is misleading. The *New York Times* has not, even in New York, the dominant position held by the *Times* in London. It represents and caters for the opinion of a relatively limited, prosperous and highly respectable class, but it does not necessarily voice any unanimous opinion, even of New York. And if one handles papers from the many great centres between the

Atlantic and the Pacific, the Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, one finds that New York itself does not necessarily voice the opinion of America. Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, San Francisco, have all their own interests and opinions. A Pacific Coast editor keeps his eye on Asia and the Pacific rather than on the Atlantic and Europe. The opinion of the twenty million Catholics counts for much on many vital questions. The London press never quotes their newspapers.

Similarly, the papers that represent Catholic opinion on the European Continent are never, or hardly ever, quoted. In pre-war days the favourite paper of Germany with the London press was the *Koelnische Zeitung*. This Jew-owned organ of National Liberalism tempered by Government inspiration was continually quoted as representing German opinion. One never heard of a much more important paper published in the same city of Cologne—the Catholic *Koelnische Volkszeitung*. Even the Conservative London papers mostly quote as exponents of foreign opinion only the Liberal and anti-Catholic papers of European countries, with the result that even Catholics are misled into the idea that there is hardly any organized Catholic opinion worth attention in several important countries—for instance, in Spain.<sup>1</sup> If a Catholic newspaper blunders into some wrong-headed extravagance it has a chance of being quoted to show how stupid we Catholics must be. One very influential paper used to quote, week by week, the *Action Française* of Paris as expressing the opinion and policy of our brethren in France. It used to describe it as "Clerical," until I succeeded in persuading the editor to describe it more truly as "Royalist," by showing him that it represented not the Catholics of France, but a group of those Catholics with the Orleanist

<sup>1</sup> Important Catholic events are often given not one word of notice in the daily press. At Madrid a few weeks ago King Alfonso, surrounded by the Spanish bishops and leading representatives of the Parliament, the administration, the army and the great cities, solemnly dedicated Spain to the Sacred Heart. This significant act of the King and leaders of a great nation was not even mentioned in a brief telegram in the English Press. During the great war a leading Catholic German review, the *Stimmen des Zeit*, and a press agency, the *Pax Verein*, published a complete refutation of the charges against the Belgian priests and people, which the Berlin Government had alleged as a pretext for the atrocities of the autumn of 1914. Not a word of this important Catholic action appeared in the London press. Similarly the London papers never told their readers that many of the Catholic papers of Germany protested against the "Hymn of Hate," the "Gott strafe England" business, and other efforts of the international hate propaganda. Later on the newspapers told of the welcome given to British wounded prisoners sent from Germany to Swiss health resorts without mentioning that the whole arrangement was the work of Benedict XV.

money behind them, a group which had shown its "clericalism" in the curious fashion of disregarding the policy advised by Leo XIII.

I wonder how many of us realize that the great telegraphic agencies are largely in the hands of the anti-Catholic "Liberal" group ("Liberal" in the Continental sense of the party name), and that in most foreign capitals the correspondents of the London dailies are mostly in touch only with the anti-Catholic groups. Some years ago I was often in Paris, and knew well Reuter's agent. I drove out with him one Corpus Christi Sunday on a long motor-car run from Paris, and in a far-off village we came upon a procession of the Blessed Sacrament. As we passed on, my friend asked me: "Was that a reliquary the old curé was carrying?" I replied with another question: "Have you never heard of Corpus Christi or of the Blessed Sacrament?" "I am very ignorant on Catholic matters," he said. "Tell me about it." I told him that merely as a newspaper man he ought to know something of the religion of the people among whom he lived and about whom he wrote. I added that when I was doing newspaper work as a correspondent in Cairo, I tried to understand Mohammedanism. I found that he had no French Catholic friends, and did not consider it worth while to look at a Catholic paper or interview a Catholic politician. He had, before this, told me that men did not go to Church in France, only women took the trouble; and he was surprised when I assured him that the evening before I had been one of a congregation of over a thousand men at St. Roch. But all the same he sent frequent telegrams and letters to the press in England about the conflict between Church and State in France, and instructed the British public on the religious situation across the Channel.

I could say much more on these matters, but what I have said is enough to suggest that it may be well worth while to let our Catholic young men and women learn something of the sources of the information on Catholic questions which they find in the daily press.

To sum up—my suggestion is that some way should be found to teach our students something of the methods of the press; to let them handle under good guidance some of the leading newspapers during their later studies, and thus prepare them for their after newspaper reading by training them in habits of judicious criticism and prudent scepticism.

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE.

## HENRY VIII. AND ST. THOMAS BECKET

EARLY in the year 1888 a skeleton was discovered in Canterbury Cathedral, in an honourable position, which had evidently not been buried there originally. Inquiries were naturally made as to the person whose bones had been found; and some of the Cathedral staff claimed them as those of St. Thomas. A not inconsiderable controversy followed in *The Times*, and in the Society of Antiquaries, which was eventually closed by a paper from the late Father John Morris, first printed in this magazine. What decided the matter, so far as regarded St. Thomas, was the very strong evidence that his bones had been burnt by King Henry VIII.

The year 1920, however, being the fifteenth jubilee of the martyrdom, has led to further developments of the controversy. Dr. A. J. Mason, Canon of Canterbury, has published, in a scholarly little volume,<sup>1</sup> the chief texts, both for the martyrdom and for the destruction of the shrine. In his quite legitimate introductions and comments, however, he has unfolded a new theory as to the burning of the bones, and arrives at the conclusion that they were not burnt after all, but only buried, and it is needless to add that he rejects the story of Henry having tried the Saint as one guilty of treason.

It is not at all impossible to pick holes in the Canon's arguments, and to show that they break down. But the dignity of the subject calls for a more serious treatment, and our fresh materials enable the story to be presented now as a connected whole, with a clearness not possible heretofore. Since Father Morris's time, the *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign and Domestic*, for 1538, has appeared (in 1893); and this gives all the correspondence of the time (with hardly an exception) in so clear a sequence, that the argument from that sequence gains quite a new cogency.

### I.

The "Becket war," as Canon Dixon calls it, took place during the "Terror" period of Henry's reign, and it is im-

<sup>1</sup> *What Became of the Bones of St. Thomas?* By Arthur James Mason, D.D. Cambridge. 1920. The present review of the subject was originally read before the Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury, on the 23rd of last November.

possible to appreciate the circumstances of our story without some idea of the persecution at this period. The chief feature for this year 1538 was "The Suppression of Shrines and Images." Visitors were sent all over England to investigate, to confiscate the riches of the shrines, and to burn their contents if they seemed "superstitious." But many details are unknown. Henry did not wish his men to act like the furious, heretical iconoclasts abroad, and doubtful relics were sent to London together with the spoil, the latter, of course, being the matter of chief import. The destruction of pictures and works of art was incalculable, and the horror of the faithful must have been unspeakable. But what is so remarkable is that this horror remained mute. The terror had been growing for five years: men knew their danger and they kept silence. The *Calendar of State Papers* for this year shows this clearly. It was not that there was no dissent at all. We have records of some mutterings in holes and corners; but we also have in the index references to no less than 300 charges of treason brought against various persons in the course of this one year. Tale-bearing, so universal and so deadly, put everyone on his guard. Executions, too, went on with hideous frequency and appalling ferocity. The brave Franciscan Friar Forest was martyred at Smithfield, slowly roasted alive over a fire kindled with an antique image of an old Welsh saint. The year was also marked by the savage slaughter of the Pole family under forms of law. It saw also a considerable extension of trial by attainder. This sort of trial was in effect no trial at all, merely a vote in Parliament, that so and so should be executed as a traitor, and his property seized for the King. It will be found that these proceedings throw much light on the so-called trial of St. Thomas.

## II.

Remembering then the iconoclasm and desecrations that were going on all over England, we turn to the fortunes of St. Thomas's great shrine at Canterbury, hitherto the glory of England, hung all over with precious stones, and jewellery of the finest goldsmith's art, so that the commonest thing about it seemed to be the gold plates with which it was covered. As early as March, 1538, the German heretics were prognosticating that it would soon be demolished, but, in fact, the blow did not fall till September,

If it is asked why the monks did not remove the bones

during the delay, the answer may be—partly because they knew, from the examples of other shrines, that any attempts to forestall the royal visitors would be met with savage punishment, partly because Cromwell had placed over the monastery a Prior, the unworthy Thomas Goldwell, who could be relied upon by the Crown to keep the residue of the community in line with the royal orders. He had possibly already agreed with Cromwell, that after the Royal Visitation, he and the remaining monks should put off the habit of St. Benedict, as in fact they did. With such a leader no heroic measures would be attempted; and even if any were attempted, nothing whatever was accomplished. We shall find conclusive proof that the bones of the Saint and all the externals of the shrine remained absolutely untouched till the fatal noons of September.

At the very end of August Canterbury was visited by Madame de Montreuil, a French lady returning from Scotland, to whom Henry wished to be polite. So she was escorted by one of his gentlemen, Sir William Penison (really an Italian called Girolamo), who wrote in detail of all the incidents of her journey, and amongst other things, describes minutely her visit to the shrine. With its riches she was much impressed, but when offered the relic called "The Head of St. Thomas," she omitted to kiss it; a slight, but, I think, a clear indication of what was to follow.

A day or two later Henry himself arrived, attended by Cromwell (my Lord Privy Seal) and Mr. Pollard, one of the principal Visitors of Shrines, and the "disgarnishing" was taken in hand at once. The work lasted for over a week (from about the 3rd or 4th till the 11th of September), and while we know a good deal of what was done, there are also some strangely blank spots in our evidence. Both Henry and Cromwell were very likely present at one time or other, and presumably watched while the greater jewels were taken off the shrine. It also seems significant that the "tips" to those who helped in the "disgarnishing," monks as well as servants, were allowed for at once from the King's privy purse.

After this, the iron-bound box, in which the relics of the Saint had been laid by Cardinal Langton 300 years before, was opened, and a rough drawing is still preserved indicating what it looked like when unclosed. The sketch further shows that the robbers took the fragment of the skull, cut off at the martyrdom, and styled from its mount, "The Head of St.

Thomas," which used to be kept apart, and they replaced it in the gap left in the wounded skull, as the letterpress to the old picture still tells us. This replacement, like a key going into a lock, proved that the bones had been carefully and effectively preserved until the "disgarnishing."

What happened next is not so clear. We hear, indeed, of the great boxes loaded with the spoils, and of their prodigious weight, but over the fate of the sacred bones a certain kind of mystery hangs.

### III.

We have, indeed, letters written on the spot, and at the very time, and from them we infer without doubt that something irreverent and dishonourable has taken place, something at which people will be shocked, something on which the King will not allow liberty of speech. John Hussey, a servant of Lady Lisle, was waiting to transact important business with Pollard, but he was entirely preoccupied with the shrine. So Hussey writes, September 8th, sardonically to his mistress, Lady Lisle, one of the court party, that "Pollard is busy day and night in prayer with offerings unto St. Thomas, his shrine and head, with other dead relics," and again on the 10th, "Mr. Pollard hath so much ado with St. Thomas's shrine in offering and praying; that he cannot yet intend to follow worldly courses. But I trust when he has prayed and reshrined the offerings and relics, he will be at leisure."

When Hussey wrote of "reshrining the offerings," which everyone knew were on their way to the melting-pot, he knew that his mistress would see the joke, and would infer that "reshrining the relics" would signify some similar humour on which official secrecy must be observed.

What had happened is recorded for us in two very different forms. *First* there is the *Vox Populi*, which says that the bones were "then and there burnt by the order of my Lord Cromwell." This report rapidly and immediately spread all over Europe, and remains on record there in numerous public and private papers. At home, as we have seen, men no longer dared, after the five years' "Terror," to speak openly against the King's acts and wishes. This is certainly strange, and should seem so to us. But the silence of the *Calendar*, so far as England is concerned, remains a fact beyond question. In the wide circle of those whose letters came into official keeping, no one wrote a word of comment.

This, however, by no means proves that nothing passed from mouth to mouth *sotto voce*, or that nothing was written down in private memorials or official memoranda. When the "Terror" was over, the same story was found to have been received here, as abroad; and it then kept the field openly and without contradiction.

*Secondly*, there was also *the official answer of excuse*. We have already heard Hussey jocularly passing over the fate of the bones by saying that they were to be "re-shrined" like the precious offerings. This "go by" we find repeated in many forms, about which we may say here that they are all bluffing paraphrases of the familiar adage—"Mind your own business!" To this we shall return.

#### IV.

Passing now to the direct evidence for the burning of the bones, the simplest way to find it would certainly be to take the clear and abundant foreign testimony. But the longer way round, by consulting the English witnesses, will furnish the surest way home. So we will attend to this first.

We have already mentioned the drawing or illustration of the shrine which shows the bones as they lay, after the shrine had been opened by the robbers. Unfortunately this is not the original, but a copy made much later by Sir Robert Cotton, perhaps sixty years or so after the destruction. Its accuracy, indeed, is not questioned, but the original may, and probably did, say more than Sir Robert copied. Stowe (who had presumably seen it earlier, for he copies the inscription *verbatim*), goes on with the words that the bones were "then and there burnt by the order of the Lord Cromwell." Nor is "honest John Stowe" alone in so speaking. Raphael Holinshed and Charles Wriothesley say almost word for word the same thing. Nor is it only the great English chroniclers who are agreed on this point. The notable German annalist Sleidanus, who came to England in 1545, was befriended by Cranmer and Somerset, says exactly the same. Moreover, his English translator, John Daws, in 1560, slightly simplifies this section of Sleidanus's story by adding another sentence, which sentence is again found inscribed (though not *verbatim*) on the Cottonian illustration.

So far we have been considering the most reputable English and German chroniclers who drew on English non-Catholic sources. Not only are they in absolute agreement,

but there is not one writer of this class who contradicts them, and they are also supported by English Catholic writers during the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth, especially by Nicholas Harpsfield and Alan Cope. In the MS. *Life of More*, and the *Dialogi Sex* (in the latter of which they co-operated), they say exactly the same thing as the non-Catholic chroniclers, and at an earlier date. As Harpsfield had been Dean of Canterbury under Mary, his evidence will represent local tradition as well.

Dr. Mason, however, has a grand, airy way of ruling these unexceptionable witnesses out of court. He describes them as "controversialists," and therefore bound to copy whatever had been said before in the Bull of Paul III.; by consequence, therefore, of no independent value. The learned Canon, however, should at least have inquired whether the papal Bull was ever in circulation, or could have reached the men he assumes to have copied it. We shall show in due time that the Bull was never published, nor its text ever known for years after Harpsfield's death. Dr. Mason's criticism, therefore, is of no value; and the unity of the earliest and best Catholic and Protestant evidence remains unshaken.

Remembering that we have still to consider the small class of English writers who use the "official excuse," we may now turn to the contemporary foreign reports for the burning.

#### V.

As no one has ever doubted the foreign evidence for the burning of St. Thomas's bones, we pass rapidly over much that might be inserted here. Suffice it to say that the lately-published *Calendar of State Papers* shows that the news had spread as far as Valentia in Spain in three weeks, and had also at about the same time reached Italy, and is shortly after found to be the talk of Brussels. Not long after the French diplomatic agents were making use of it while negotiating with Spain.

The extraordinary features of the desecration had deeply scandalized the faithful abroad, even more than it shocked those at home, who now for five years had been accustomed to Henry's freaks of impiety.

More important, because of its eventual consequences, was the advent of the news at Rome. The first trace of it comes in the Consistorial Acts for October. On the 25th the fact

was announced by the Pope in Consistory, and a committee was appointed to discuss and report upon the affair. In this news there is no mention of the trial of the Saint. It is a serious blemish in Dr. Mason's work that he should have ignored this official Roman report to which Father Morris had directed attention in 1888, as the *Calendar*, published in 1893, had also done, and added references to further MS. authority.

The conclusion from the foreign evidence is clear. The burning was soon known everywhere, and the report was everywhere accepted.

#### VI.

Many a reader has heard the striking but imaginary story of Henry calling St. Thomas to judgment, by having a writ of summons laid upon his tomb. To this we shall come in due time, but we must begin with the contemporary documents, which are strange enough.

On November 16, 1538, King Henry published a long proclamation, making new decrees on many subjects, both dogmatic and disciplinary. The Supreme Head defined a number of tenets to be held as of faith by his obedient subjects, certain practices were imposed as of obligation, while others (oddly enough) were to be held temporarily until His Highness has further reflected. Finally, he comes to the topic of St. Thomas, and "by the advice of his Council," he issues a revised history of his death. Finally he pronounces sentence. The once canonized martyr is declared to be unsainted, his name and his image is to be removed from every church and chapel, from every painted window, service-book and calendar, and his feast is never again to be celebrated. As it was said, so it was done. Thousands of windows were smashed, hundreds and hundreds of service-books were mangled, the feast of "the blissfull martyr" ceased to be held. Such was the real trial and sentence on St. Thomas.

From other sources we glean a few, though only very few, further particulars. The proclamation begins its section on St. Thomas by saying that his want of virtue "now clearly" appears. Similarly, the "Summary Declaration," which followed next year on the same subject, also begins in the same strain, "It now appeareth by approbations" (*i.e.*, proofs); and both these phrases seem to assume that some previous examination has taken place. Moreover, the courtly Matthew Parker says that the King acted "with the assistance of the

prelates and nobles of all his realm, by diligent and laborious research."

These few and vague clues seem to contain all the information available about the judicial proceedings against St. Thomas. Putting them all together, we can see: (1) That what took place happened *after, not before* the burning. (2) That there was no *formal* trial. (3) But there was probably some meeting of courtiers, including some Court bishops. (4) That statements were here made on the unsaintliness of the martyr, and some documentary proofs were also alleged. (5) Hereupon the courtiers "advised" the King to degrade the Saint, (6) which Henry did, as we have heard, on November 16, 1538.

To call this freak of exorbitant tyranny a trial may seem at first sight a misnomer. There was no pretence at all of sincerity or of justice, or the recognized forms of law. But when one remembers the trials by attainder, which in this very year reached such great and terrible development, one can see a clear family likeness between the two procedures. If the proceedings against the Poles can be called a trial, I do not see why anyone should be blamed for calling the proceedings against the Saint a trial, a Tudor trial, if you will, for under those princes, however, many forms of law were broken or observed, the Crown in every trial inevitably obtained all that it aimed at, however inequitable, unjust, or violent.

Another noticeable Tudor whim shown in this proclamation is that it joins an almost mad outspokenness on some points, with absolute silence about the sacking of the shrine and the burning of the bones! But though this seems inexplicable according to ordinary ideas on the need of consistency, it may perhaps be partly accounted for by Henry's repugnance to the vulgar iconoclastic heresies of his day, partly also because of the tyrant's scornful disdain for the honourable desire, which every right-minded Englishman felt, to know what had become of the relics of the great champion of their ecclesiastical liberties.

## VII.

We have heard that the Pope had condemned in Consistory, on October 25th, the burning of the bones, which had taken place about six weeks before, and had appointed a committee to advise what should be done. By the middle of December the news came in of Henry's sentence (of November 16th),

which had unsainted the martyr. The Pope now acted promptly. On the 17th he signed the draft of the Bull of Excommunication, which bears that date, and this must now be quoted. After stating that the bones of St. Thomas were kept with great veneration in a golden shrine, it goes on to say that Henry,

after he had caused Saint Thomas himself, for the greater contempt of religion, to be called into judgment, and to be condemned as contumacious and to be declared a traitor,—ordered him to be exhumed and burnt and the ashes to be scattered to the winds.

It will be seen that this passage adds three phrases to the statement made in Consistory on October 25th. The burning, it is said, took place "after Henry had had the Saint himself called into judgment, condemned as contumacious, and declared a traitor."

To what do these words refer? Before the publication of the *Calendar of State Papers* made the course of the previous correspondence as clear as it is now, different authors gave different answers; but none saw that the words signified *neither more nor less* than the royal proceedings published on November 16th.

In proof of this we notice, in the first place, that there was fully sufficient time (*i.e.*, thirty-two days) for this news to reach Rome; an express messenger could do the distance in twenty-four days. Then this proclamation itself was an offence so grievous in the sight of the Church that the Pope could not mention the burning without also condemning Henry's insolent sentence. Thirdly, the Pope's few words correspond quite well with Henry's long utterance. Precise quotations are not to be expected in Bulls of this class, which are written in Latin, and give the alleged offence in a condensed form.

Fourthly, we have the parallel with a letter of Cardinal Pole written on the same occasion as the Bull (Mason, pp. 134, 137). Pole having more scope, quotes much more fully from the proclamation than the Bull does. So much so that no one can doubt that he had the proclamation before him, as Canon Mason confesses. The citation in the Bull, on the other hand, is very short, and this shortness may prove a difficulty to some. It may be easy to see that two lines are parallel when both are long. Whereas when one line is very short the same con-

clusion may not be clear. In the case of the Bull we may be sure that, if Pole had the proclamation before him, while drafting a subordinate dispatch, the Pope would certainly have had it in mind while deciding the principal document.

The *State Paper Calendar* for 1538, published in 1893, made it clear what papers would in the ordinary course have reached Rome before the Bull was issued. Before the *Calendar* appeared, the state of chaos into which the papers of Henry's reign had lapsed, made it impossible for students to decide with any certainty what the Pope had in mind when he wrote. Even Mr. Gairdner, the editor of the *Calendar*, did not perceive it (see his *Preface* and his *Lollardy*, p. 152). Canon Dixon, indeed, did see it, but did not feel sufficiently sure about it to say so in his text. He only speaks tentatively and in a footnote. Dr. Mason still differs from his fellow Canon, and his reasons shall be discussed later.

We have still to notice that Paul III. has made one great mistake in his reference to Henry's acts. He says clearly that Henry tried the Saint first, and burnt his bones afterwards; while in reality the bones were burnt in September, the sentence was not passed till November. Yet there are evidently many excuses to be made for the Pope's mistake. Henry's freaks of tyranny were so strange that it is difficult to credit them even when all the evidence is before our eyes. But before or during the journey to Rome the news was probably translated or abbreviated, and might very easily have got divorced from its authentic date, which was the more possible as the date occurs, not in the body of the document, but in a colophon after the end. In any case, the error made was a most natural one, was not inspired by hostile motives, and indicates, if anything, a desire to avoid extremities.

So much for the history in outline of Henry's onslaught on the bones of St. Thomas. Though the Terror made the English people strangely slow in speaking of the King's excesses, the story passed *sotto voce* from mouth to mouth, and was set down in private by diarist, chronicler and writer of memoirs. After the Terror was over, the same story is told here as abroad by Catholic and Protestant alike. As for the "Trial," that is largely a matter of terms. The King claimed to issue a sentence based upon proofs. Why then should not his hearers say that he had tried the cause?

J. H. POLLEN.

(To be concluded.)

## PHILOSOPHERS IN CONGRESS

**A**N International Congress of Philosophy was held at Oxford last September. In many respects it was a memorable and successful meeting, but to one who reflected what such a Congress would have meant in the best age of Greece or at the Renaissance, the comparative lack of interest shown towards it must have been very disappointing, especially as the modern world is supposed to be occupied with reconstruction after the greatest war in history. The promoters of the Congress were, no doubt, slightly to blame, for there was little advertising, and the programme of the meetings was disfigured by cumbrous or unmeaning titles. But this does not explain all, and the real reason is that philosophers are no longer, as Aristotle or Hobbes, tutors and counsellors of kings or parties; they have ceased to be an influential class and have fallen on evil days. To their place super-journalists, like Mr. Wells, or practical statesmen, like M. Clémenceau, have succeeded, and inevitably, we may add, as a consequence, the door has been opened for opportunist and makeshift policies and rash, silly verdicts on the universe and destiny.

If, then, the promoters of the recent Congress had in mind to restore the prestige of philosophy by checking irresponsible thought, submitting useful counsels and giving scope for reflection inspired by the best minds of the world, the intention was excellent, but it would be an exaggeration to say that the expectations were altogether justified. Nevertheless, I think that all earnest-minded men who were present must have been glad to notice the absence of frivolous discussions, of that hocus-pocus which has in the past brought such discredit on the name of philosophy. For the most part the subjects were living subjects treated in a live way, though, of course, many questions were bound to arise which belong neither to this century nor that exclusively, nor to any particular time or place; the perennial questions of the soul and body, mind and matter, religion and ethics. These do not stir tumultuous passions as centuries ago, but they form the basis of all sound thinking. And it is here that the good sense of the speakers showed itself—in their sincere endeavour to avoid freakish novelty. There were exceptions, indeed, who thought it tame to keep in the middle of the road, and

chief among them were some Neo-Realists.<sup>1</sup> But with these exceptions, as I say, the whole trend of the conference was towards a tentative acceptance of what not only Catholicism but the history of the world has pronounced sound.

M. Bergson, in the opening address, gave the tone to the subsequent meetings. While there was nothing remarkably new in what he said for those with some knowledge of his line of thought, his earnestness was not without its effect, especially as he ended with an appeal to all to realize the importance of the spiritual life, how they must co-operate with the Pure Spirit, God, in the establishment of good. The definitely theistic turn at the end marks M. Bergson's public avowal of what he was known to believe before, but the occasion gives it a special significance.

The papers and symposia which continued for the next three days varied in importance, and it is impossible here to concentrate on more than two or three. But I must first meet an objection. It may be urged that the philosophers present were pygmies, far short of the stature of men like Comte or Huxley or J. S. Mill or Herbert Spencer, and that, therefore, their conclusions cannot count for much. But surely M. Bergson, Lord Haldane, Mr. Balfour, Dean Inge, Bertrand Russell—to mention only a few—are not pygmies! Besides, what may have been wanting in distinction was made up by numbers, for representatives from all over the globe, France, Belgium, America, Poland, India, Japan, were present. And for this reason alone it is worth while looking to see where the modern mind stands and whether it is progressing—a counsel of prudence, at least, let us call it. Hence the pleasure in finding Catholics—a comparatively small number, alas!—present, including representatives from Louvain and other centres in Belgium, the Catholic Institute of Paris, and other Universities of importance.

Among the first subjects to be discussed came Relativity. The meaning and bearing of Einstein's theory have been already explained in these pages by Father O'Hara,<sup>2</sup> and in

<sup>1</sup> Neo-Realism, as presented by some of the speakers, appears to the present writer as at least quixotic—(Some of its opponents were less polite and called it rank nonsense). To an ordinary intelligence it is gratuitously crooked. What, for instance, is one to think of the statement that red-hot snow is real—and that its reality consists in its not fitting into relation with fire or frost? But then so many find something satisfying in the theory, that one is bound to reconsider one's judgments that it will never do, and hope for further light. Still, may the truths of common sense never have to depend solely on such tortuous reasonings!

<sup>2</sup> See *THE MONTH* for December, 1919.

the *Dublin Review* by Father Gill and Father Leslie Walker. Hence there is no need to say anything on the general theory. It should be noted, however, that the agreement, even on essentials, is less than might be supposed, and, again, that scientists, almost invariably, mingle their own pet philosophical views with the scientific conclusions. On this occasion a number of distinguished scientists took part—Professors Eddington, Lindemann and Whitehead, while only one philosopher, Mr. Ross (the translator of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*), was down to speak—an Athanasius *contra mundum*! But strange to say it was not Mr. Ross who was overwhelmed, for the symposium had not continued for long before the scientists were politely quarrelling with each other. The derided philosopher could afford to smile when Professor Eddington claimed, "that all the more familiar terms of physics, duration of time, mass, force, energy, etc., denote, not objective characters, but relations to some observer or his idealized equivalent"; when Professor Lindemann reduced all truth to a matter of convenience: "our notions of space and time are essentially metaphysical conceptions, and as such are clearly merely a matter of convenience or even of taste"; while Professor Broad repudiated Professor Lindemann's flippancy and distrusted Professor Eddington's making Nature simply the almost unknown referent of these and other relations. "Scientists," he well said, "generally neglect the existence of minds while going about their lawful business. When, at a later stage, minds are forced on their attention, they tend to be embarrassed. If they be stupid, they deny minds altogether, which seems to be the usual refuge of the dogmatic biologist. If, like Professor Eddington, they have too much sense to do this, they are liable to go to the other extreme and taking *omne ignotum pro magnifico* to ascribe to minds, powers and functions which they probably do not possess." Later on, Professor Whitehead, who was in the chair, dissociated himself from his fellow-scientists and sketched his own point of view, admirable in its lucidity so far as it went, but leaving on the horizon certain philosophic clouds. Thus Mr. Ross was never driven from his position "that the belief in absolute space, absolute time and absolute motion is not a mere prejudice of common sense, but something that necessarily underlies all our thought, and that the argument which tries to disprove them is assuming them all the time."

The impression therefore left after the meeting is that the

scientific Relativists have not yet secured a philosophic setting for their theory, and that a philosophy will demand considerable modifications in the theory if it is to stand at all. The relativist is still too much of a Thrasymachus, and his view may not be so revolutionary as is imagined. Father Leslie Walker would find it in harmony with Aristotle,—that is to draw its teeth with a vengeance. (!)

There was less serious divergence of view in the symposium on Nationality, but unfortunately this was partly due to the lack of one single clear issue. No Olympian statement was forthcoming, not even an ambiguous oracle. The value of the discussion lay rather in *obiter dicta*—in the direction which reflection took. The French contributors were concerned mainly with the League of Nations—and two opposite views were expressed. M. Halévy maintained that the League of Nations could not be established on one principle, namely, President Wilson's self-determination, to the exclusion of others such as natural frontiers and the balance of power, while M. Marcel Mauss, a disciple of Durkheim and Jaurès, regarded those other principles as antiquated. Internationalism was the central idea and ideal of his policy, an Internationalism which could go hand in hand with Nationalism and could be defined "as the sum total of such ideas, sentiments, rules, and collective groupings, as have for an end to make possible and direct relations between nations and between societies in general." On the other hand, Gilbert Murray confined himself to the worth of the principle of Nationalism. For him Nationalism had in it nothing particularly sublime; it was important because so dangerous. Arising usually from oppression or the intoxication of success, it produced self-respect and pride, but led to a most pernicious form of selfishness because hidden under the guise of altruism. To keep it within bounds and make of it a constructive instead of a disintegrating factor in civilization, he saw no other device save the League of Nations. Mr. Balfour admitted the truth of Professor Gilbert Murray's charges against Nationalism; it was like a spoilt child, and could make mischief. Nevertheless, those responsible for the League of Nations and the Peace Treaty had admitted as far as possible the principle of self-determination. But they had been foiled time and again by the embarrassing situation of nation within a nation—areas or islands within a State of alien populations, like plums in a pudding. So far from these petty nationalities having the right to disturb the peace

on any principle of self-determination, he regarded it as their moral duty to subordinate their particular interests to the welfare of that State within whose confines they were. The peace and safety of civilization, of the larger community, were more precious than the precarious privilege of self-determination.

Thus many interesting and disputable points were raised—but they were not fought out to an issue, and many must have felt that the symposium had only touched the verge of the real problem—namely, what is nationality and to what extent is it a moral whole with rights, and, granted these rights, what duties do they entail and how far are they to give way or to be modified when in collision with other principles? As an instance in point, I might refer to the unification of Italy. Text-books of history and Liberal historians have accepted without demur—nay, written with extravagant praise of the unification of that nation, as though an ideal—if it be an ideal—justified actions which meant the over-ruling of existent rights and privileges. Surely Nationalism is an ideal only in the sense in which individual liberty is an ideal—and liberty is only a condition—a *sine qua non*—not an ineffable glory in itself. Pressing the analogy of the individual, is not Nationalism the counterpart of the individual's realization of his own responsibilities—his own personal and inalienable prerogatives? When and how a group can possess a common consciousness will vary according as their ideals harmonize. As Sir Frederick Pollock pointed out, almost every definition breaks down; neither race nor language nor even religion suffice. Switzerland, for instance, has three official languages; The United States have no racial unity. These provide the materials, it is true; but it is the soul which makes a nation, and hence one could conclude straight off that a group must have more than common interests or ambitions before they can be a nation—they must, briefly, have ideals. An affinity of ideals—the deepest bond between man and man—leads to a union which finds in the soil, in common tradition, and in custom, the flesh and blood in which an ideal is incarnated. If this be so—nationality is a natural form of union which is too spiritual to be defined in terms of any particular interest—though for its continued existence it demands certain varying conditions such as, perhaps, language and race. In what concerns its moral rights and duties—following again the analogy of the individual—certain principles can be laid down, though these principles

will need careful scrutiny in practice owing to collisions of right—just as the rights of the individual may clash with those of the State. Simple and obvious as this may appear, there is need for clear thinking and clear statement, for the confusion of ideas is as pronounced in political theory as it is in social problems. It has not been sufficiently recognized since the time of Rousseau that the general will is no arbiter of morality—it is the end which determines the act, not the multitude of clapping hands. The true doctrine of Nationalism is to be found in germ in Plato's laws, where the law-giver is compared to an archer who aims only at that on which some eternal beauty is always attending.<sup>1</sup>

It remains to speak of the symposium on philosophy and of those on ethics and religion. The titles of the philosophical subjects were, as I have said, ludicrously cumbrous—the actual discussion, however, was fresh and significant. In "The Meaning of Meaning," three of the best representatives of modern philosophy had been asked to take part—Dr. Schiller, the Pragmatist; Mr. Bertrand Russell, so notorious for many reasons, and the author of Neo-Realism; and Professor Joachim, of Oxford, who is best described as the associate of Mr. Bradley and Professor Bosanquet. Dr. Schiller, as defiantly as usual, crossed swords with Intellectualism, but he found nobody willing to accept the challenge at first; indeed, it is now safe to say that Pragmatism as a definite theory has gone the way of all extremes; it is dead. Neo-Realism seems to have taken its place. The reason of that supplanting, I suppose, is that the conclusions of the latter theory are not eccentric, and that it is hand in glove with science, for science, in contrast with its imperiousness in Victorian days, is now feeling its way into philosophy. May we, therefore, suggest that a philosophy in touch with scientific tendencies, and at the same time critical and firm in its conclusions, would find ready acceptance both abroad and in England; a philosophy establishing the proper relation of science with itself—more intellectualistic than the school of Poincaré or Duhem, and yet free from formulæ, which may be left behind. Where Neo-Realism fails is in its constructive side, and this lamentable weakness was ruthlessly pointed out by Professor Joachim. The absolutist ultra-intellectual standpoint of Professor Joachim is, however, no more than Pragmatism, welcome nowadays. True, some form of Pan-

<sup>1</sup> See a useful discussion of the subjects involved, in "The Principle of Nationality," by F. F. Urquhart: *THE MONTH*, December, 1907.

theism will always be with us, but it was remarkable that its voice was so seldom heard during the Congress; even Lord Haldane only hinted at a watered-down form of Idealism. The evening session on the relation of the Universal to the Particular but confirmed the impression left by the earlier symposium, Neo-Realism being rejected as nonsense and Idealism being bandied about as a term of reproach.

I have reserved the debate on the relation of Religion to Ethics to the last as the most important. The title had been suggested by Professor Le Roy to meet a practical problem, namely, how far moral instruction in education required religion as a support. Professor Le Roy was, however, unable to attend, and the papers and speeches were not confined to that particular issue. In many ways it was a remarkable meeting. The intransigent attitude towards religion, so prevalent once in France, the placid spoliation of its rights by soft-spoken philosophers, had vanished. Instead, we saw the first fruits of long-suffering and evil days, a recovered equilibrium, a recognition of the place of religion in any prosperous commonwealth. The exquisite delineation of Christian virtue by Baron von Hügel suggested that the rich beauty of unpretentiousness, of gentle heroism—as seen in a Blessed Thomas More—of creative love and delicate truthfulness, withered when religion was taken away. By religion the dreams of a perfect life were made half-possible, and, as the horizon of life expanded, virtues and graces interpenetrated, and we became seers of visions in a sordid day. Following him, Professor Chevalier, of the University of Lyons, filled in the Baron's picture with a strict Catholic interpretation of conscience and the Divine Law. His hearers were slightly restless at the unswerving orthodoxy of Professor Chevalier, and later accused him of simplifying matters too much; but it was all to the good that so Catholic a thinker should have set before a somewhat nonplussed audience what came very near to the Foundation in St. Ignatius' Exercises. Neither Professor J. A. Smith, of Oxford, nor Principal Jacks decried religion, though they did not see eye to eye with what had been said by the first speakers. Principal Jacks, however, was very successful in removing the Absolutist claim that religion was but the indwelling of spirit in all life. If that were so, better far to make friends with the Mammon of matter than to worship a spirit which worked in evil as well as in good, and permeated the false equally with the true. Such a neutral, all-complacent Deity should be crowned with wool, and bidden with all respect depart to another city.

The decisive speech of the afternoon was, however, that of Mr. Balfour. Quite apart from its excellence, it was the testimony of a man who had lived amid large issues, and in a long life "looked before and after." He had encountered Naturalism, battled *non sine gloria* with the greatest Victorian scientists, tested the evolutionary hypothesis and played a principal part in the reconstruction of Europe. To many foreigners present his words were representative of England's philosophy of life as no other's. Hence, when he pronounced his confession of faith in religion and foresaw an emasculated civilization, were it deprived of the religious motive and the love of God, something real and substantial had been won. That his speech was a fitting end to the session was shown by the departure of a great number, though there were still some French philosophers to speak. They failed to impress; and this was satisfactory, as they were of the past generation of France, the survivals of an unbelieving anti-clerical system.

The general verdict on the necessity of religion was far more pronounced than might have been anticipated; and yet, without wishing to be hypercritical, we may question whether the problem was not left unanswered. For the subject was the relation of religion to ethics, and instead of making clear the specific, irreplaceable character of religion, its well-wishers weakened their position by treating it as a mere appanage of morality. "Religion is valuable because it serves and strengthens morality." Probably they felt an apology for religion was required because some religions have worked mischief and undermined morality; and besides, a sense of right and wrong seems more obvious, more necessary for the constitution and welfare of human society than religion. But quite apart from there lurking in such a view the old fallacy of trusting to a fallen humanity to cure its own ills, it leaves altogether out of account the most vital and ultimate concern of the soul which is with God, and not with fellow-creatures—though the relationship with God will react on relations with man. Religion is valuable in itself and immeasurably higher than morality. Taking the sense in which the word was used in the symposium,<sup>1</sup> I should be inclined to seek its

<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately religion is often taken to be an emotion, which is therefore contrasted with philosophy or moral theory. Having given to human reason the primary place in value, philosophers perforce are led to justify religion by its utility in keeping moral conduct up to the mark. They will not see that it is not a mere emotion—but a realization of God's sovereign power over their own incomplete being, and that the lie direct is given to rationalism in the most profound and intimate reflections of the self.

origin in the most intimate life of the soul, in what is revealed by a person to himself. The consciousness of independence and dependence, of anarchy within and impotence, of yearnings for fulfilment, of relative unsubstantiality, is but the soul's realization of its own nature, of its creaturehood. Here is the preamble to religion proper—the reflections which may take the form of F. Thompson's "Anthem of Earth" or St. Augustine's "Confessions," or be worked into a philosophy such as that of M. Blondel's *L'Action*. Thought brings the self to the presence of God, and puts it on its knees in worship and adoration. But that is not all. For its natural hopes are far surpassed in the Christian religion, where a supernatural life is given to the believer—a life which puts religion as far above morality as Heaven is above earth.

I have attempted to show the significance of the recent Congress, and to emphasize the importance of paying some attention to the way philosophers are viewing the present situation and noticing whither their minds are turning. It is part, perhaps, of the creed of an Englishman to neglect ideas—but, willy-nilly, they have an effect on civilization. If acknowledged and criticized, ideas can be fashioned into forces for good; if neglected and shunned, they work like inhibited emotions in the subterranean chambers of the self, and are only recognized when their ill-effects compel attention. It would be folly, of course, to make any prophecy of the future on the evidence of one Congress, but of this I am convinced that at no time has there been a greater desire for a coherent and lucid interpretation of life—for some living tangible good to take the place of the will-o'-the-wisps pursued vainly for so long. There is a well-known saying of Hegel that the owl of Minerva begins its flight when the shades of evening have begun to fall—meaning that a period of reflection and hard thought follows on a time of intense activity—as the philosophy of Greece flourished when the great cities were spent with war. The next few years may well see the garnering of the fruits of the last few years. Please God, those who can point the lesson, and contribute from the heaped-up tradition of two thousand years may do so successfully, for mankind has gone weeping and casting its seeds, and it is time that it should return home with gladness carrying its sheaves.

M. C. D'ARCY.

## PAGES FROM THE PAST

### CHAPTER XI.

**W**HEN this series of papers began, the war, which had come four years before to change everything, was as yet unfinished: during those four years it had come to be realized, I suppose, by almost everyone, that the old pre-war world was gone for ever, as thoroughly lost to us as the United States were lost to England when the War of American Independence was over.

Without ascribing to that vanished world any shining perfection, many of us regretted its disappearance: we knew its faults and were used to them, as people know the thin places, the faded places, or even the patched places in old garments—and are comfortable in them. Those who had already lived through, perhaps, two generations, could not flatter themselves that they at any rate would live to see the new, the promised, world in full emergence. They could hardly be its heirs, or come into their share of its inheritance. So that they, these elderly persons, felt themselves in a fashion disinherited: like those who having dwelt (as their forbears dwelt) pleasantly on the whole if imperfectly, in an old house, faulty and not exactly splendid, but familiar, and replete with comforts and memories, have lived to see their old home pulled down, and know themselves to be too old to live to see the new house planned to be erected on its site. Very likely, in their foolish but faithful hearts, they can never believe that the new house will be as easy, or as comfortable, to live in as the old. They are assured that it will be much better, larger, more commodious, lighter, better ventilated, handsomer, more convenient, cleaner, all the old tolerated but intolerable inconveniences and incongruities replaced by the latest and most perfect contrivances for the supply of light, air, and comfort. They have seen the plans, and have had to admit the architect's cleverness: have been quite unable to deny that he has shown admirable skill and forethought. But there seems, maybe, to them to be *too much architecture* about the new house, too great elaboration of ingenuity in planning. The dear old discarded, vanished house, never had, so far as they were aware, any traceable architect. In successive generations rooms were added, enlarged, or altered as the need came. It never was planned, or designed, but grew like the family itself. And how it suited them!

So these, temporarily houseless, poor things feel themselves homeless: and have chill misgivings of never having a home again. Their juniors very probably think more of the fine new house that is coming. They are, or seem, more practical than the seniors. They are not disposed to cry over spilt milk; and surely an antiquated, superannuated old house, that had to go, and has gone, is spilt milk. The old house was well enough—in its way. It had a sort of makeshift suitability, they confess. But was it architecture? Was it really a house at all?—with its odd aggregation of rooms, its queerly placed entrances, its several staircases, instead of one grand stairway, leading directly to all the fine upper rooms, directly, and so visibly to every entrant, as to have something almost allegorical about its grandeur—Excelsior! What inconveniences the old house had—what obsolete appliances for light, for warmth, for cleanliness! especially for cleanliness: why, in the new house, the lavish supply of hot water would simply force everybody to be clean: the inhabitants could, if they chose, almost pass their whole time in hot water without effort or trouble. "Perhaps they will," think the doubting seniors.

Yes: when these Pages from the Past began to appear the war had not been won, and though the old pre-war world was gone, the new, post-war, better, world was hardly due. No one was so unreasonable as to demand its arrival till Victory should have come to be its herald.

Then Victory did come: and the Armistice: and finally Peace. With whom? With Germany and her Allies of course. With whom else had we to arrive at peace? Quite so. It could hardly have struck anyone that England needed any truce with herself, an armistice at home, in view of any victory to be achieved over herself. Foreign wars are proverbially strong safeguards of domestic peace.

Well, the victory of the Allies over Germany and her confederates came, and the Armistice came, and Peace treaties with Germany and her confederates have been drawn up and have been signed. And, perhaps, these things already seem to have happened a long while ago. What a distant dream is the memory of London's orgy of delight and happiness on Armistice Night: a Saturnalian *Te Deum*, perhaps, but as true as death, sincere as anguish. Millions must remember it: can any of them deny that it is a Page from the Past—a page blazing with lurid colours, elf-lights, but ever so long past?

I would ask them to turn back to it, if they can, and see how very, very distant in experience it reads.

I, who am but rarely in London, was in London on that day, brought thither for farewells to one bound overseas—and gone.

A few minutes before eleven, on that strange Armistice morning, I was in Buckingham Palace Road, shopping: coming out again into the street, presently there were heard up in the air bombish noises, and for an instant there came the silly idea, "Are they—those wonderful Germans—treating us to a last impotent defiance and insult, a final air-raid?"

I wonder if anyone else had for a second that stupid fancy?

There were in a moment plenty of faces at the windows, of figures at the shop-doors. Some had the dubious look of people who might be sharing my doubt. But the doubt was already gone, and the signals in the air were understood. Being so near it I went round at once to the palace. In front of it there were already a few others—not many: in five minutes there were hundreds, in ten minutes there were thousands, crowded against the grille of the palace yard, clinging to the old, great, Queen's monument, pouring, pouring down the Mall past the ugly, captive German guns. On the open space within the railings soldiers were changing guard. The King came to the balcony on the palace-front, and the Queen, and their daughter, and the King's brother.

Over and over again, as it seemed, the soldiers' band played "God Save the King," and the people outside sang it; every eye fixed on the King himself. No one ever hears it more reverently than he: it is a hymn—to God: a nation's prayer. For his own great Office, for the peoples over whom it sets him, for God to whom the Empire Prayer is lifted, no listener ever stands fuller of reverence.

On that unique day he stood very silently, almost motionless. Between him and his people there was nothing but space, but the space was too wide for audible words. His lips moved but I think with no attempted, futile, loud speech: a whisper could be heard as well whither it was addressed. The King seemed very still, very grave, like one in God's house rapt in the thought of what God has given. It was a very devout quietness. The people, it was plain to see, understood it all and respected. Victory had come: by Divine Mercy. England had not been vanquished. With a tiny army she had moved, at an austere word, to stand by her

friends against the hugest, most efficient, armed force the world had ever known: at the hard word "Duty" whispered in her ear, she had answered "Adsum," and risen from her island hearth to go out and help her assaulted neighbours. And after a long agony she had, once again, triumphed. I am sure the people understood: she had again conquered—but how long the agony had been. And of England's slow torture the King of all the English must be mindful on this Victory morning. Her fighting sons would presently come home, but how many had *gone* home! The King must be thinking of that: the King and the Queen at his side.

Like him she stood in a very thoughtful quietness. There have been Sovereigns who, in the hour of conquest, have been so drunken with success as to seem unaware what victory has cost: as if none fell in battles that have been won, as if at any rate only enemies fell in them: as if at home were no war-orphans, stricken parents, desolate wives: Sovereigns too who have snatched all war's acrid glory to themselves, as if they had been their own sole legionaries and Captains, the agents as well as the master-minds of their victorious campaigns. And so their triumphs have had some tinge of selfishness, of callous blatant *loudness*, even of vulgarity.

But our Sovereigns, on that strange, half-realized, morning of longed-for victory, were wholly otherwise. Theirs was a very reverent self-silence: a most mindful quietness and a very noble simplicity of gratitude: and the people showed in every glance upwards to them that they felt and honoured it.

They joined, time and again, in singing "Rule Britannia": but they loved their Sovereigns no less because they perceived in them a grave memory that many Britons had, in guarding her, passed beneath the waves, though high as heaven. They thought, and the King and Queen thought, very thankfully, of victory: but Victory's august robes are dark with blood. Among their own kin and friends many were widowed, sonless, fatherless, though victory had come at last; and the people would have reverenced their Sovereigns less had they seemed, in the great hour, forgetful of their subjects' loss and mourning. Even Victory has but slow salve for torn hearts. And our Sovereigns were not the Sovereigns only of them who lived to share the triumph, but of them who lay far from home that their homes and the homes of others

might stand unviolated, of those tens and tens of thousands of young men who had been willing to go themselves childless down eternity that the children of others might still be born free.

This memory—which thousands must share with me—of that scene upon that memorable day: is it not altogether a memory, a Page, veritably, from the Past? a page very noble, very solemn, quiet, but incomparably august, and belonging irretrievably to the past?

The night of that same day makes a sharply different page: though not less singular. The scene just described, though thousands were in it, was like a confidence, a whisper, between the Sovereigns and their people. The soft greyness of the morning suited it.

After dark the colour-scheme was red and black. And there was certainly nothing confidential, meditative, about its sound-tones: nothing could be less suggestive of a whisper. It was anything rather than quiet. There was no hush of restraint about it, nor hush of any kind, nor restraint of any sort. All London seemed to have resolved itself into a jazz-band, and to have come out of doors to jazz together, without rehearsal, or any tiddling fuss about combination or understanding of other performers' instruments, other performers' steps. It was a glare of noise, a blaze of red laughter, fiery, blinding, deafening—like a barrage. It was not merely Post-war, it was Pre-Christian: Pre-Roman even. To call it Bacchantic would suggest Bacchus, who was not notably in charge: and might suggest something choric, which it was not in the least.

One heard people who remembered tell each other it was Mafeking Madness gone madder. On Mafeking Night I was far from England and could not remember. But I should think it was not like anything that ever had been: or at all like anything for which we are like to have occasion again, since we are to have no more wars, but only quarrels with our friends and with each other: just to bleed ourselves ill-temperedly to death, instead of reverting to the execrable taste of weakening our alien foes.

Certainly Armistice Night in London was queer. Royster-  
ing, not measurably distant from rowdy, and yet not absolutely rowdy: blatant enough; hypercritical people might have said vulgar—only no one was disposed to hypercriticism or to any criticism: and how can that be vulgar which is genuine, sincere, and real? No one could doubt its naked sincerity:

savage nudity may be indecorous, but is it vulgar? Some clothing is less decorous and more indecent, and the clothing of many "civilized" persons is incomparably less decent and more vulgar.

The burning of captive enemy guns did not seem vulgar, but maniacal—"lest we remember."

There was, externally, nothing tender about Armistice Night out of doors: but it was transcendently good-tempered. Indoors there must have been anguish of remembrance, though in the streets there was evidence of none, which does not mean that there was none. Children there knew that their fathers would now come home and they would not be orphans: wives that their husbands would not be gone for ever: elders that their lads would take again the vacant places at hearth and board. So they danced, or smilingly watched the uncouth dancings.

Those behind the windows seemed forgotten, but may not have been: those whose boys no Armistice, and no Peace, could clothe again, for their sight, in the fair raiment of the flesh till the world's own Last Post shall sound: those whom no victory could make less widowed, or bring home the father to earn again their children's bread. Many a girl behind those illuminated casements had but lately heard that her betrothed would never be her husband—he had been called to a more dread tryst with Death: she knew herself jilted for the stern mistress Duty, hand in hand with whom her lover had, but now, passed out of her own streaming sight. To all those how piercing must have been in the ears of their hearts the shouts of barbaric jollity smashing the sable silence of the night, the swishing stamp of dancing feet.

Perhaps Victory of her nature is hard-hearted, like all one-sided beings. She must be one-sided, or she would be but the obverse of the shining medal whose reverse is wan Defeat. "Vae Victis" cried the ancients, as if there were no pangs among the victors, no losses, no wounds and slow-healing scars.

Certainly the two leaves of the Diptych that make up one's memories of Victory Night in London are pictures sharply different in tone and quality: but each to be forever remembered. Both are pages from the past, with more of resemblance, perhaps, to what had gone before than to any present we have as yet attained. They should have been the wind-up of the old world; but the new world, so boastfully promised, has not come to hand. It may come, but

will hardly be identified with the fancy portraits published on either side of the Atlantic. The brazen old world had been in society so long that she managed her own affairs, chose her own partners, and "sat out" without much occasion for a chaperon: but the lovely and youthful new world was to be exposed to no risks—safeguarded from indiscretions, have all her partners arranged for her, and be precluded from any rash and private sittings-out by a most effectual chaperon, the League of Nations. But the chaperon has not yet exactly succeeded in herself achieving the necessary solidity of personal status, nor the authority without which she can never enforce obedience. It is all very well for this new Mrs. General to form her lips into gracefully decorous words like Papa, potatoes, poultry, prunes, and prism: only Fanny Dorrit won't listen, and forms her own lips to pronounce very different words. Like Mrs. General the new chaperon is rather expensive: but, also like her, not very efficient. I do not gather that Mrs. General was much beloved: everyone was more eager to recommend her to other employers than to secure her decorous presence themselves: though she had one elderly admirer who was ready to break up his home for her sake. Here, of course, the parallel between her and the new chaperon breaks down.

The new world spends a great deal more than the old, but without the old world's thrifty calculation of her income: she spends first and then looks in someone's pocket for the money. The young woman is, frankly, extravagant: fonder, it would seem, of show than of solvency. So she is a good deal embarrassed. Like other young persons she is prone to indiscretion in the choice of her friends, and some of her acquaintance are not easily tolerated by her more tried friends, who have borne much for her sake. "*Noscitur a sociis*" they murmur, and for their own part flatly refuse to be dragged into intimacy with some of the new world's partners. The old world may have been duller, but she was incomparably more dignified than the new: and more respected out of doors. She was known outside as an excellent manager, and kept her house on the whole in exemplary order: matrons who succeed in doing that are usually well thought of by neighbours, even if all the neighbours do not passionately love her, even if she is reputed fond of her money, and apt to be prudent in the spending of it: but young housekeepers whose children are rebellious, whose servants are extravagant, flaunting, over-dressed, and pert to

their mistress, are not so well respected in other houses: especially if it comes to be believed that the lady has shady friends, that indeed it is safer not to lean too confidently on her friendship, or rely entirely on her word: that on the whole she is readier to oblige strangers than those who have helped her at her need. Even a very talkative young house-mistress ends by losing the confidence of elderly neighbours of standing: it is rare to talk a great deal without talking too much. Babblers mostly contradict themselves in a day or two. Gush is seldom for long sincere. Your incessant, glib, talker is apt to tell fibs.

The new world is never silent for ten minutes. She reverses the rôle of the sailor's famous parrot. She is not a very patient or accurate thinker, but she talks the more: and unfortunately some of her phrases have been picked up in queer company. Her bank-balance may not be comfortable reading, but she yells cheques. Her company manners are not faultless, her home manners are deplorable: it's worse manners to snatch, and to put your fingers in other people's plates than to put your own knife in your own mouth.

Of course the old world was not nearly so clever as the new. She was slower, and cared more for understanding her own affairs than for brilliance or originality. She was not very boldly experimental. She was apter at keeping house than at theories of house-keeping: maybe, she trusted more comfortably to experience than to abstract principles of domestic science. Her neighbours' daughters might get prizes at school for Domestic Science, but she practised it, almost as unconsciously as M. Jourdain had been talking prose all his life without knowing it. She had not the reputation of a clever woman, but she knew more than she said, and did more than she knew. On the whole other women's husbands rather envied her homely capacity. She was not over-fond of brilliant servants, preferring servants who kept their place, and knew her ways. Her servants were not allowed "followers," and her footmen were not indulged with latch-keys. They had to be indoors of nights, and if she had heard of their making speeches at street corners she would know the reason why.

Perhaps she was a little middle-class. Middle-class matrons have a *bourgeois* fondness for having more money than they spend, and mostly take a sturdy pleasure in knowing that they are better off than they seem. They would certainly dislike giving away more than they have got.

The new world is cleverer. Too clever by half. Her cleverness is the asset she is always offering her creditors instead of ready money. She hopes it will be taken and mistaken for actual cash. Why should not promises be current coin in the Land of Promise? After all they are only post-dated cheques, and the money *may* come in before the date.

The new world has lovelier sentiments than the old. If her sons starve she says heart-moving things about them, and says them with rivers of real tears. She is rather given to tears, and gets maudlin in her cups, cups not of wine, of course, but brimming with the intoxicant of sentiment. The milk of her human kindness may be a bit watery with those tears, but it is flowing and copious.

She is tender to a fault for the erring, if not very encouraging to those of her household who have not yet misbehaved. Her pity for animals is extreme: on the whole she likes them better than men, certainly better than children. When animals get their old-age pensions they will be paid with less scrutiny and deduction than are those of human claimants. It will be remembered that those claimants are dumb.

She is wider-minded, this new world, than the old: more apt to perceive that crime is only the influence of Environment: theft the result of wanting something the poor thief has the misfortune to lack: divorce the singularly natural sequel of an ageing or disagreeable wife (or husband) or else of a more cultured beauty-sense in the person anxious to contract a new marriage, and (necessarily) eager to be free from the old and stale one: she has not much pity for the discarded wife or husband, whose disappearance is essential to the happiness of the poor thing panting to escape from his (or her) bonds: though no doubt every care will be bestowed on divorced dogs, even if they have not been in fault, and for puppies orphaned by the divorce of their fickle parents.

She is brilliantly hand-to-mouth, the new world: a mistress of temporary expedients. She is an expert in remedies for disease which cure you an hour or two before you die. She has only read the Protestant version of the Scriptures (and not that very lately) and "takes no thought for the morrow." So an expedient for Monday is always forthcoming though it leaves Tuesday a good deal in the lurch.

She lives in London, and is not much interested in her country inheritance. Outlying estates acquired by her forbears are, she finds, troublesome to administer: and apt to

be expensive. She likes the rents but hates being bored by the troubles of ownership. She sends copious, and very beautiful, telegrams down to those out-of-sight-out-of-mind estates, but does not greatly care what her agents are about, or what agents she has there. Remarkably queer some of those agents are, and their language about herself is peculiar. But it never occurs to her that language means anything: she is used to her own.

She is almost abjectly sincere in one thing, her timid dread of any rows out of doors: her Pacifism is as genuine as "blue funk": Pacifism, of course, is the art of quarrelling only with one's friends, never with an enemy, never even admitting that an enemy is at all hostile. Her mama knew very well who were her enemies, and didn't mind showing that she knew. If other ladies "said things" about her they mostly did it behind her back—but, of course, she was told: and she soon let them perceive that she knew all about it, and intended behaving herself accordingly. Ladies did not make faces at her in the street (ladies were ladies then, and besides they didn't dare). But the old world's daughter is quite used to hearing herself abused "loud out," and seldom attempts a repartee: she hardly ever goes abroad without some "lady" making faces at her, or even putting her tongue out: she can't help seeing it, but she takes no notice. Her mama would have given that lady "what for": but then her mama did not pretend to be Pacifist, and didn't think it paid to put up with "cheek": she wouldn't stand it, indoors or out: it was thoroughly understood she would not, and it was not attempted. If a row with a neighbour was necessary she wasn't the woman to shrink from it. So rows were uncommon: certainly she would not have pretended to like any other lady because the man who worked her central heating liked her, or abstained from teaching any lady her place for fear of a rumpus in her own basement. . . . Yet anything like a row below stairs was very rare in her time, and on the whole her neighbours thought a good deal of her. Absolute love is, perhaps, seldom seen among neighbours, but they knew what she meant, which is generally the case when you know yourself. They all confessed she managed her own family well. Out of doors she was civil if not gushing: and her ready money was sincerely respected. . . .

Well, well. The new world is very young yet. There may always be improvement where there's room for it—and there's plenty.

JOHN AYSCOUGH.

## SOME PHYSICAL PHENOMENA OF MYSTICISM

### THE MYSTIC AS A HUNGER-STRIKER. I.

THE question how long a man can live without food has been much debated of late by all sorts of writers and in all sorts of contexts. It is obvious that the answer in every case must depend very largely upon what kind of man we are thinking of. It depends, in other words, upon how he is constituted, not only physically, but also morally and psychically. I may confess that I am not yet quite convinced that in the course of nature every one must die who deprives himself of both solid and liquid nourishment for more than a few weeks. No doubt, if we are talking of the *ordinary* course of nature, the rule that a man must eat to live is true enough. But there seem to be exceptions, and it is not quite clear to me that these exceptions can only be explained by assuming the intervention of the supernatural.

Speaking from general impressions, one would be tempted to affirm that all the more conspicuous and protracted cases of abstinence from food (*total inedia*) are to be found among the ranks of the Catholic mystics. Whether this is so exclusively the case as is commonly supposed will appear further on in the second part of this paper, but there can be no question that the Lives of the Saints, assuming for the moment that their data are reliable, present us with many most astounding examples of unbroken fasts. It is alleged that St. Lidwina († 1433) eat nothing for 28 years; the Venerable Domenica del Paradiso († 1553) for 20 years; Blessed Nicholas von Flüe († 1487) for 19 years; Blessed Elizabeth von Reute († 1420) for 15 years, and so on; while in modern times a 12 years' abstinence from food (always, of course, excepting the consecrated Host received in Holy Communion) was observed in the case of both Domenica Lazzari († 1848) and Louise Lateau († 1883).

Of Domenica Lazzari a good deal has already been said in the articles on stigmatization (see especially THE MONTH, October, 1919, pp. 291-296). Dr. Dei Cloche, whose medical report of the case was there largely quoted from, seems to have had no misgivings as to the fact of Domenica's total abstention from food, and the same is apparently true of

the German doctors, whom Lord Shrewsbury and Mr. Allies and his friends found to be studying the phenomena at a very much later date. It is noteworthy that Domenica was absolutely bedridden, and any somnambulistic tendencies could hardly have escaped the attention of her sister who lived with her. Of course it is possible that an hysterical patient, who turns away with loathing from all food during the day, may prowl about at night in a somnolent state and satisfy unconsciously her dormant physical craving. Such a thing might go on undetected for a month, or even several months, but hardly for thirteen years. Moreover, one cannot but be impressed by the analogous features present in other similar mediæval cases which it would violate all probability to suppose that Domenica had ever heard of. One of the most remarkable mystical documents of the early thirteenth century is the Life of Blessed Mary of Oignies by Cardinal Jacques de Vitry, an unusually intelligent and conscientious observer, who knew her intimately. In perfect accord with the physical repulsion for food which was so conspicuous in Domenica Lazzari<sup>1</sup> and Louise Lateau, we read of Mary of Oignies:

On one occasion she went for as long as thirty-five days without any sort of food, passing all the time in a tranquil and happy silence. . . . She would say nothing for many days but "Give me the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," and as soon as her request was granted she returned to her former silent converse with her Saviour. . . . At length after five weeks, returning to herself, to the wonder of those who were present, she began to speak and to take food. But for a long time afterwards she could not in any way endure even the smell of meat, or of anything cooked, nor of wine, unless it was an ablution after the Blessed Sacrament, which was sometimes given her, in which case she minded neither the smell nor the taste.<sup>2</sup>

And again, referring to a period at the end of her life when Jacques de Vitry was himself undoubtedly with her:

During her illness she was able to eat absolutely nothing, nor could she even endure the smell of bread; yet notwithstanding this, she received the Body of our Lord without any difficulty. And this dissolving itself, as it were, and passing into her soul, not only comforted her soul, but relieved her bodily weakness

<sup>1</sup> See what I have previously quoted in *THE MONTH*, October, 1919, p. 292.  
"When a small fragment of sugar was placed upon her tongue . . . the fit of vomiting was so violent that she almost choked."

<sup>2</sup> Oratorian Translation. p. 343.

immediately. Twice during her illness it happened that on receiving the Sacred Host, her face was illumined with rays of light. We tried once whether she could take an unconsecrated particle, but she instantly turned away, having a horror for the smell of bread. And the pain and uneasiness she felt at a small portion having touched her teeth, was so great that she began to cry out, to vomit and spit, and to pant and sob, as if her breast would have burst. And thus she continued to cry out a long time, and though she washed her mouth with water over and over again, yet she could hardly rest throughout the greater part of the night. Yet however infirm she was in body, and however light and weak her head was, since for fifty-three days before her death she ate absolutely nothing, yet she could always bear the light of the sun, and never closed her eyes against its brightness and splendour. And what is still more strange, though we often sang loudly in the church [astonishing as the fact may seem to our modern notions, it is to be remembered that Mary was actually lying *in* the church, in a side chapel where she had had a couch prepared for her at the beginning of her illness in order to die there] and rang the church bells, which made a loud and sharp noise, close at her ears, and that for a good while together; and again, when many masons were striking and knocking with their mallets at an altar which we were having built to be consecrated by the Bishop of Toulouse, yet none of this noise gave her the least disquiet or uneasiness, when once she knew that it was for the service of God or His Church. She herself said, when we were commiserating her, that the sound did not jar upon her nerves, nor ever go near her brain, but that she received it directly in her soul, where it gave her great sweetness.<sup>1</sup>

It is impossible not to be struck by the analogy between Mary's condition and the hyperæsthesia which, as remarked in the article already referred to, was so conspicuous in Domenica Lazzari. When Dr. Dei Cloche induced the latter to smell some toast, her face, we are told, was contorted with pain, and, after violent spasms, she fainted away. I am by no means saying that these manifestations are in any degree supernatural or divine. Similar symptoms are common in many hysterical disorders. My contention for the moment is confined to this, that in these states of mystical union, the normal functions of the sentient and nutritive processes of the body often seem to be profoundly altered, or at any rate partially inhibited. The psychical element, in fact, appears in some strange way to dominate the physical. Even the

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 440, 441.

hypnotic trance furnishes phenomena of much the same kind. If I am not mistaken, the experiment has more than once been tried with certain peculiarly sensitive subjects, of administering a strong emetic before inducing the hypnotic trance. As long as the trance lasts, even though it be protracted for two or three hours, the subject is not inconvenienced, but when he is restored to normal consciousness, the emetic at once takes effect.

Somewhat earlier than the experience of Mary of Oignies, we have the case of the visionary in the Abbey of Eynsham, near Oxford. During the year's noviceship which he spent in that house it is recorded of him by the sub-prior Adam, an eye-witness, that "his stomach abhorred so greatly meat and drink that some times by the space of nine days or more he might receive nothing but a little warm water. And whatsoever thing of leechcraft or physic any man did to him for his comfort or his amendment, nothing helped him, but all turned contrary."<sup>1</sup> Another example, equally remote from Domenica Lazzari and Louise Lateau, is that of St. Catherine of Genoa, at the close of the fifteenth century. As Baron Friedrich von Hügel, summing up the evidence in the case of this remarkable mystic, remarks:

As to food, it is clear that, however much we may be able or be bound to deduct from the accounts, there remains a solid nucleus of remarkable fact. During some twenty years, she evidently went, for a fairly equal number of days—some thirty in Advent and some forty in Lent, seventy in all annually—with all but no food; and was, during these fasts, at least as vigorous and active as when her nutrition was normal. . . . Practically the whole of her devoted service (in her hospital at Genoa) fell within these years, of which well-nigh one-fifth was covered by these all but total abstinences from food.<sup>2</sup>

Baron von Hügel further calls attention to the fact that during these fasts she received Holy Communion daily, and also, as was customary at Genoa, a draught of wine by way of ablution, and occasionally, at other times, a little water rendered unpalatable by an admixture of salt or vinegar. But the fast seems to have been continuous for forty days without any interruption on the Sundays, and her confessor Marabotto leaves us clearly to understand that she *could* not

<sup>1</sup> *The Vision of the Monk of Eynsham*, Eng. Trans., p. 19. THE MONTH, Jan. 1898.

<sup>2</sup> *The Mystical Element of Religion*, II, p. 33.

at these times take any solid food or any other form of drink. Under obedience she attempted to do so, but the stomach instantly rejected anything she received in this way. Still more significant is the fact to which Baron von Hügel specially directs attention, "that these two conditions and functions, her fasts and her ecstasies of a definite, lengthy and strength-bringing kind, arise, persist and then fade out of her life together." And from this he deduces the conclusion that, as the ecstasies must have greatly diminished the stress and strain of ordinary existence, "the amount of food required to heal the breach made by life's wear and tear would by these ecstasies be considerably reduced." This is, no doubt, a possible explanation; but it must be remembered that in the case of Domenica Lazzari, at least, there was no apparent ecstasy, though, at the same time, she had not any external duties to perform, but led only the life of a suffering invalid in bed.

Before turning to any similar experiences which are nearer our own times, it seems necessary to say something of the particularly well-attested case of St. Catherine of Sienna. No one who has any knowledge of the wonderful personality of the Saint, of the intense sincerity and devotion which breathe in all her letters, and of her strenuous efforts to reform moral abuses and stimulate any work of charity, can for a moment be in doubt of her personal truthfulness. The only question which could arise would be as to the possibility of some somnambulistic consumption of food of which she herself was unconscious. But under the conditions in which her life was passed this would be almost incredible. She lived with a retinue of maidens, who, out of devotion to her person, watched her in some sense night and day. They detected at once the unreality of her pretences of taking a meal when she sat at table with them. To appreciate the full weight of the evidence it is necessary to read the whole of chapter xiv. in the *Life of St. Catherine*, by Mother Francis Raphael.<sup>1</sup> She is the only biographer who has been able to utilize all the materials, including more particularly the canonization processes, which throw so much light on this more marvellous aspect of her history. It is only possible to quote a paragraph or two here, but it will be understood that the

<sup>1</sup> Her account is, of course, based upon the Life by Blessed Raymund of Capua, Part II. ch. iv. The Latin text of this is printed in the *Acta Sanctorum*, April, Vol. III.

evidence is much fuller than can be thus indicated. Speaking of the period when St. Catherine began to communicate daily, the writer says:

This heavenly food satisfied and supported not only her soul, but her body also; so that ordinary food became no longer necessary to her, and the attempt to swallow it was attended by extraordinary sufferings. This fact seemed to her family and those about her so incredible, that they readily enough decided that it was a deceit of the enemy, and her confessor ordered her to take food daily, and give no heed to any visions which might seem to prescribe the contrary. She obeyed, as she invariably did, but the obedience reduced her to such a state that they feared for her life. Then he examined her and drew from her the fact that the Blessed Sacrament so satisfied her as that she neither desired nor was able to take any other food; nay, that the mere presence of the Blessed Sacrament, or of the priest who was privileged to touch it, in some sort refreshed her and supported her bodily strength.<sup>1</sup> As he still hesitated, in doubt what to think, Catherine said to him with her customary sweetness and respect: "Father, I would ask you to tell me one thing; in case I should kill myself by over-fasting, should I be guilty of my own death?" "Yes," said he. "Again," said she, "I beseech you resolve me in this: which do you take to be the greater sin, to die by over-eating or by over-abstinence?" "By over-eating of course," he replied. "Then," she continued, "as you see by experience that I am very weak and even at death's door by reason of my eating, why do you not forbid me to eat, as you would forbid me to fast in the like case?" To that he could make no answer; and, therefore, seeing by evident tokens that she was near the point of death, he concluded by saying: "Daughter, do as God shall put in your mind, follow the guidance of His Holy Spirit, and pray for me; for I see that the things God works in you are not to be measured by the common rule."<sup>2</sup>

Now these facts do not depend upon the statements of historians who, living long after the events described, gathered their information from hearsay and tradition. Our sources here are the notes of her confessors, Father Thomas della Fonte and Blessed Raymund of Capua himself, together with the testimony of intimate friends and disciples such as Father Thomas Caffarini and Francis Malevolti. From September,

<sup>1</sup> I may call attention to this curious parallel in the Life of St. Catherine of Genoa: "Having been infirm for many days, Catherine one day took the hand of her confessor and smelt it; and its odour penetrated right to her heart, so that for many days this perfume restored and nourished her, body and soul." F. von Hügel, *Mystical Element of Religion*, I., p. 184.

<sup>2</sup> Mother Francis Raphael (Drane), *History of St. Catherine of Sienna*. Second Edition. I., pp. 198-9.

1372, until the Lent of the following year, Catherine could only take the smallest quantity of nourishment, and "from Passion Sunday until Ascension Day, a space of fifty-five days, no kind of food passed her lips, yet neither her weakness nor her sufferings seemed to diminish her activity in all good works."<sup>1</sup> She herself says in a letter still extant:<sup>2</sup>

You tell me I ought to pray God that I may be able to eat; I assure you before God that I use every effort to do so, and that once or twice every day I force myself to take food. I have constantly prayed to God, and I do and will pray, that He will grant me to live like other people, if such be His will.

Though this letter speaks of her forcing herself to take food, it is certain from the testimony of those who sat with her and watched her, that what she took in this way was immediately afterwards rejected. In one of her last letters to her confessor, Blessed Raymund, at the very end of her life, she says: "My body remains without any kind of food, not even so much as a drop of water, and its sweet sufferings are so great that I have never felt anything like them, and my life hangs, as it were, by a thread."<sup>3</sup>

Such examples as that of St. Catherine are by no means rare in the annals of Christian asceticism. In the case of another daughter of St. Dominic, the famous Mother Agnes of Jesus, in the seventeenth century, we have precisely the same physical repugnance for ordinary food, induced, it would seem, by a similarly intense devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. She did incredible violence to herself to eat what she was bidden to eat, but do what she would, she could not retain it. Père Boyre, S.J., one of her directors, assures us that at one period she was allowed to give up the attempt and passed seven months without any other food than the Holy Eucharist. She became very weak, but did not look ill. Afterwards she gradually, but with great suffering, recovered the power of taking ordinary food, although always in a very small quantity.<sup>4</sup> Without delaying further over other ancient examples I will only note that this physical repugnance for solid food, or for certain forms of food and drink, is often found in mystics who are not attempting to practise complete abstinence. For example, to take the case of a very modern stigmatic who has already been several

<sup>1</sup> *History*, p. 202.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 204.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* II., p. 244.

<sup>4</sup> See the admirably documented *Vie de la V. M. Agnès de Jésus*, by Lantages and Lucot, Paris, 1863 ; II. pp. 180, 360, 361.

times mentioned in these articles, when Sister Maria della Passione wished to abstain from food altogether throughout Lent, her director would not permit it, but required that every 48 hours, or in other words, on alternate days, she should take a meal consisting of two or three ounces of bread with a little oil. This she did under obedience, and all went well. If, however, her superior, or any other person, persisted in requiring her to take other food, she obeyed like a good religious, but what she took in this way she immediately brought up again, together with a quantity of blood.<sup>1</sup> The same director further informs us that he allowed her, in the year 1912, to fast from Easter to Pentecost, during which time it appears that she took no other nourishment than a little coffee in the evening. Let me hasten to add here that I am very well aware of the frequent occurrence in hysterical cases of strange perversions of the appetite and also of inexplicable repugnances for certain articles of food, while the vomiting of blood, sometimes pure, sometimes diluted with a watery fluid, is one of the most common symptoms of the same class of disorders. It is impossible, therefore, without much fuller and more minute inquiry than can be attempted here, to regard these phenomena as constituting a presumption of the interference of the supernatural. But still, they ought to be recorded, if only because they show that a considerable number of these cases of prolonged abstinence offer many points of analogy with the pathology of hysteria.

But let us turn now to the case of Louise Lateau, the well-known stigmatisée of the Bois d'Haine, which not only belongs to modern times, but which has probably been more studied and discussed than any other example of the same kind of phenomenon. We have the advantage of being able to use both the voluminous biography of Canon A. Thiéry,<sup>2</sup> still incomplete, and also the much more convenient and better ordered abridgment published last year.<sup>3</sup> Louise Lateau was the daughter of simple peasant folk; she was born in 1850 and died in 1883 in the same one-storied cottage in which she saw the light. Although from a medical point of view there was no bad family history in the case of either of her parents, still it seems to me that her biographers exaggerate when they imply that in her early life she was healthy and

<sup>1</sup> "Ma poi lo rigettava con forti sbocchi di sangue." Fontana, *Vita della Vittima Reparatrice*, 1917. The director in question is the author of the Life.

<sup>2</sup> *Nouvelle Biographie de Louise Lateau d'après les documents authentiques*, four parts already published, over 1900 pages in all, 1915-1918.

<sup>3</sup> *La Stigmatisée Belge, Histoire Abrégée*, pp. 328: Brussels, J. De Lannoy, 1920.

normal. She was a good child who worked hard and devoted herself to help others in every way she could. At the age of thirteen she was knocked down and trodden upon by a cow, and though she said nothing about it, the internal injury seems to have been serious. Abscesses formed and she suffered a great deal of pain. In 1867 there was some serious trouble of the throat which led to her receiving the Last Sacraments, but she was miraculously cured during a novena to Our Lady of La Salette. Three weeks later she became the victim of neuralgic pains of a very intense kind, and these were followed by more abscesses, and also by blood-spitting. As a result, at the beginning of the following year (1868), she was believed to be again at the point of death, but once more she unexpectedly recovered, and at the same time she began to have visions and to hold colloquies with her celestial visitants. Even before this, on the first Friday of 1868, she had felt intense pain in hands, feet and side, though no external marks were as yet perceptible. On the 24th of April blood ran from her side, on the 1st of May, the upper surface of the feet was also bleeding, and a few weeks later the hands were similarly affected. Concurrently with this Louise began to be notably more absorbed in God during the time of these visitations, and on July 17th, 1868, she passed into an ecstasy which lasted for two or three hours, and then returned later in the same evening for a much longer period. From that time forward both bleeding and ecstasy recurred on the Friday of every week. Meanwhile the dislike for food was steadily growing. Louise had always been a small eater, but after the ecstasies and the stigmata had begun, though she continued to do hard manual work on all days except Fridays, when her wounds incapacitated her, still the amount of nourishment she took became less and less in quantity. On Fridays no food of any sort passed her lips, and what she took at other times amounted to no more than an ounce or two of bread, half an apple or a spoonful of vegetables. March 30th, 1871, was the last day when Louise was able to eat and digest any solid food without acute suffering: she did her utmost to obey when her mother or her confessor urged her to take nourishment, but, as in the cases we have previously noticed, if with great difficulty she forced herself to swallow anything, the stomach rejected it almost immediately afterwards. Dr. Warlamont noticed that when milk which had been taken and returned in this way was examined, it showed no signs of curdling, a proof that

the gastric secretions were practically non-existent. Many experiments of this kind were made by various members of the commissions appointed to examine the poor girl's condition. She could not even retain a non-consecrated host, though she received Holy Communion daily, and there was apparently the same difficulty about a spoonful of pure water. After May, 1876, she had to take to her bed, and from that time forth the Blessed Sacrament was brought to her daily, but, curiously enough, I have not found any statement as to whether she was able to receive the ablution of water commonly given to the sick after Communion.<sup>1</sup>

At the time when the very acrimonious discussions concerning the reality of Louise Lateau's *inedia* took place in the Belgian Academy of Medicine, Louise had already, so, at any rate, it was alleged—lived for more than four years without any sort of nourishment but the Blessed Sacrament.<sup>2</sup> This abstinence continued until her death in 1883. It is admitted by practically all the many medical men, some friendly and some hostile, who concerned themselves with the case, that no fragment of positive evidence has ever been produced which can throw doubt upon the statement made by Louise, her sisters and confessors, that during all those years she took no food. No one pretends, even during the years when she still was busy with hard manual work, to have seen her eating anything by stealth. No testimony was ever forthcoming to disprove her statement that the normal excretory processes were entirely suspended. On three or four occasions at least she was solemnly adjured by those whose authority she recognized as holding the place of God, to tell the truth regarding her abstinence and to confirm her statement with an oath. On these occasions she never showed the slightest hesitation. For example, in March, 1878, she was very ill, and Dr. Lefebvre, who was vested by the Bishop with full powers, said to her:

Louise, since your strength is ebbing fast and you are near death, in the presence of God before whose tribunal you will soon be judged, tell me if you have eaten or drunk anything during the last seven years?

To which she replied:

In the presence of God who is to be my judge, and of the

<sup>1</sup> The ecstasy into which she fell almost immediately after receiving Communion probably prevented this.

<sup>2</sup> See the report of the debates in the *Bulletin de l'Académie royale de Médecine* for 1876, Vol. IX.

death I am expecting, I assure you that I have neither eaten nor drunk for seven years.<sup>1</sup>

With regard to the poor sufferer's sincerity there can I think be no shadow of doubt. Even among the most rabid of the anti-clericals, those who had any sort of personal acquaintance with Louise did not question her good faith. As Dr. Lefebvre very well argues:

When one follows the hidden way of life of this humble and brave girl, who lives so poorly, shrinks from all notice, refuses all presents; who works like a slave to help her mother and yet finds time to nurse the sick and bury the dead; who prays with the fervour of an anchorite and the simplicity of a child; who compresses the most solemn practices of piety within narrow limits for fear of encroaching upon her hours of work, there arises from such a life a perfume of truth which in spite of all doubts and suspicions penetrates to the very bottom of one's soul.<sup>2</sup>

If we do not admit that Louise Lateau's abstinence was real, the only possible alternative is to suppose that during her seemingly sleepless nights (she herself declared under cross-examination that she hardly ever slept) she passed into a somnambulistic condition or assumed some secondary personality, so that her normal self was quite unaware of what then took place. There are undoubtedly cases on record of those who, unable to eat in their waking hours, unwittingly satisfied their cravings of hunger in the night-time. Still, while one might easily believe that such unconscious deception might continue for a few weeks or months without discovery, it is hard to believe in the possibility of its going on undetected for three or four, much less a dozen, years. Would nothing be missed in a thrifty household where every fragment of food is counted and treasured up? Would no signs of this somnambulism or this secondary personality ever betray themselves at any other hour than when the whole household was asleep? Would it never happen that in that tiny cottage some unexpected noise would draw attention to the fact that the invalid was astir, the more so that, as already pointed out, from 1876 Louise was practically bed-ridden?

It seems to me, then, very difficult to suppose that the stigmatic's alleged total abstinence was not real. But the question whether it was supernatural is another matter, which can hardly be discussed in the present article.

HERBERT THURSTON.

<sup>1</sup> Thiéry, *Nouvelle Biographie*, II. p. 413.

<sup>2</sup> *Revue Catholique*, April, 1876, p. 377.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### THE SOURCE OF CIVIL AUTHORITY.

A MOST interesting discussion on the above subject, one which gets additional importance from its bearing on current events, is being carried on in our learned contemporary, *The Irish Theological Quarterly*. In its October issue, Professor O'Rahilly, of Cork, brought forward the extreme democratic view of the origin of the civil power and claimed for it the support of St. Thomas, Suarez and the great majority of the classical scholastics, as against the less "popular" views of later moral philosophers. In defence of these latter, Dr. John Fitzpatrick, of Clonliffe, has taken the field in the January number with the contention that the Suarezian view, which was once, he owns, *sententia communis*, has now been rendered obsolete by the growth of historical and political science, and he is able to cite a variety of Papal pronouncements, which, though not infallible, are of more weight than mere theological opinion, in support of his strictures. It may, perhaps, be possible for one standing outside the lists wherein these doughty combatants are contending, to point out the common ground which is not in dispute and to particularize the exact issue between them.

No Catholic can deny—it is a truth of revelation—that all civil authority comes ultimately from God, who made human society, and consequently willed all its essential attributes, of which a centre of authority is the chief. Professor O'Rahilly holds that doctrine as strongly as Father Fitzpatrick. They would also both agree that God has not prescribed any particular form of civil polity, but has left the various groups of humanity which we call nations to choose the form that suits them best, whether it be a monarchy, absolute or limited, an oligarchy or a democracy. All that God prohibits is anarchy. Thus whilst He decrees that the State should have some effective polity, He is ready to sanction any form that men may select, provided it be workable and just. Where our disputants begin to differ is in this. Professor O'Rahilly holds that God has vested authority in the community at large,

which thereupon, for convenience of government, delegates it to some individual or group, retaining the right to recall it at will: whereas Dr. Fitzpatrick maintains that all the community has power to do is to select the form of government that pleases it, on the head of which, thereupon, God directly confers the requisite power to rule. Hence this important consequence: the community cannot recall what it has not given; only, if the ruler, or the form of government he administers, turns out to be injurious to the common welfare, then it has the power to make a fresh choice.

These then are the two theories, the distinction between which in practice amounts to this,—the former allows the people to change its form of government at will; the latter only when the government fails to fulfil its *raison d'être*. Does the distinction really amount to very much in effect? As a matter of fact, many modern governments have reached their present form by historical evolution, and not by any formal choice of the people at large. And in all civilized governments the evolution has been constantly in the direction of giving the people more power. It seems to us that the liberty which both schools grant to the community to choose the civil polity that best suits it, joined to the fact that the suitableness of this or that form may and does vary with time and circumstance, renders the practical difference between them very inconsiderable. For we presume that Professor O'Rahilly would not sanction a change of government on the part of the community arising from mere fancy or caprice or passion. The community, like the individual, must act according to reason. That being so, if the community as a whole seriously thought that the common good, which is always the criterion in these matters, would be better promoted by a change of polity, it would be justified in making that change, always supposing that the improvement effected bore due proportion to the disturbance created by the process. Again, Dr. Fitzpatrick would hardly deny that any community making a new choice of government would have power to limit it in various ways. The supreme power in the United States is bound by a written constitution: there is no such check in the English polity, but in practice the will of the people is consulted whenever any considerable piece of legislation is projected. The government professes at least to seek and to execute popular mandates. Thus it would seem that the English civil polity regards itself as

responsible ultimately to the people. Whenever, therefore, a community, in designating its ruler, does not will him to have absolute authority, it would seem to claim the residue for itself, and thus to assert itself as still his superior. In other words, in a pure democracy the community designates itself as ruler, and then delegates certain functions of government to selected persons.

If such a community, therefore, being hitherto a limited monarchy, chose to elect a Parliament pledged to institute a Republic, on the grounds that such a form of government would be more economical and effective, we could not say that it was acting *ultra vires*. So the power of choice vested in the people in democratic policies means more in practice than Dr. Fitzpatrick would seem to allow. They act as if they did delegate power to govern, and their rulers are careful to get their consent for important measures. Thus, there is little difference in practice between being the source and being the channel of authority. In putting out a fire the effect is the same whether I direct the hose myself or show another where to direct it. And if the community may lawfully change a good polity for a better, much more are they justified in supplanting a bad system of government by a good. This right is so universally recognized in democratic States that we see a Republican party in the Spanish Cortez and a Royalist party in the French Parlement, and even in the British Parliament, a Socialist, *i.e.*, anti-monarchic body,—all of which are openly aiming at the overthrow of the existing system. And if ever by constitutional means they should succeed in winning over the great majority of the nation to a belief that their system was better for the commonwealth than the existing one, they would have a right to give effect to their present speculative views. Accordingly, if a people may change their form of government whenever it seems to them reasonable to do so, the Catholic teaching as to the origin of civil power makes little difference one way or the other.

J. K.

---

THE CATHOLIC CONFERENCE OF HIGHER STUDIES.

**U**P to the present the Conference has held two annual meetings in the Christmas vacation, one at Oxford and one at Cambridge, and of those who have attended them there is probably no one who doubts that as an institution it

has come to stay. This was strikingly evinced at the last meeting by the almost unanimous rejection of a suggestion that the Conference should assemble only every second year, and even more so by its determination to remain without a fixed centre of meeting. This latter resolve was due to the desire to make the burden of travelling more or less equal for all and to tap all parts of the country, while it indicates the confidence of those who adopted it that, as it becomes better known and understood, the Conference will find a ready welcome wherever it can be suitably lodged. As regards accommodation, the plan adopted hitherto, which seems likely to be continued, has been the payment of a fixed sum by each member of the Conference to cover the material expenses of those who have been good enough to take them in. The kindness and hospitality experienced nothing could adequately repay.

We have not been without our casualties. Father Anselm Parker, O.S.B., then the head of the Benedictine Hall at Oxford, had much to do with the founding of the Conference, but at the critical stage suffered a breakdown, from which it is a pleasure to hear that he has now recovered. Father O'Dowd, M.A., at that time the head of St. Charles' House at Oxford, valiantly stepped into his place, and did much to make the first Conference a success, but his untimely end, in the prime of his age, was a great blow to those interested in the enterprise, and at one time seemed likely to hinder the holding of the second meeting. (R.I.P.) Father Whitfield, M.A., the head of St. Edmund's House, Cambridge, contributed greatly to make the latter a success, and his kind hospitality and zealous care, as well as those of our other hosts at Cambridge, will not easily be forgotten by the members attending.

The 1919 Conference at Oxford was only a tentative beginning, but from the outset its success was assured and universally recognized by those present. At the following meeting of the English bishops the whole scheme was approved, and His Eminence Cardinal Bourne kindly undertook to represent their Lordships in regard of the Conference. At the recent Cambridge meeting a committee of five was appointed for five years, consisting of Dr. Hyland (Rector of Wonersh), Father Corbishley, M.A. (Professor of Scripture at Ushaw), Father Williams, M.A. (Head of St. Charles's, Oxford), Father Hugh Pope, O.P. (Doctor of Sacred Scrip-

ture, etc., Hawkesyard), and Father Lattey, S.J. (Professor of Scripture at St. Beuno's). The Conference has thus been set upon a permanent footing, and may look for even wider support. On both occasions so far the attendance has numbered over twenty. The papers read have been valuable in themselves, and have been representative alike in regard of readers and subjects. For instance, at Oxford, Dr. Miller, Vice-Rector of Oscott, read a careful study of St. Augustine's doctrine of sin, while Father Hugh Pope discoursed of the teaching of Scripture, alike from a historical and pedagogic point of view. In the department of Canon Law, Mgr. Cronin, D.D., a well-known authority on the subject, set forth some of the effects of the new Code, while Mr. Urquhart, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Balliol College, threw some useful light on the teaching of History. Dr. Vance, M.A., Vice-President of St. Edmund's, had kindly undertaken to read a paper on the Study of Philosophy, but was prevented from doing so by his work at Prague, and Father Walker, S.J., of Campion Hall, took up the theme very effectively at rather short notice. At the recent Conference the papers were of no less weight and interest. Mr. Atteridge, a member of the C.T.S. Committee, and a well-known Catholic journalist and author, spoke from his own wide experience on the subject of the Press; Dr. Kendal, O.S.B., of Downside, read an instructive paper on the need of adopting a sympathetic attitude in Apologetic; Mgr. Parkinson, D.D., Rector of Oscott, summed up his own experiences on the teaching of Social Studies in seminaries; Father Corbishley treated the difficult subject of the spirit-world of St. Paul, while Father Moncel, S.J., outlined a Catholic Science of Character, an important department of modern psychological study; and Father Stebbing, C.SS.R., author of the well-known *History of the Catholic Church*, spoke convincingly of the importance of the subject and the aspect from which it should be viewed. The papers were listened to with the respect and interest due to experts handling their own subjects, and provoked interesting discussions.

In considering the scope and purpose of the Conference, it must be remembered that it is intended primarily to promote intercourse between those who are teaching in the higher faculties, that is to say, in philosophy and theology, with the allied subjects that with them make up the course of ecclesiastical study, such as Science, Canon Law, Scripture, His-

tory, Liturgy, and the like. The comparative isolation of our seminaries had long been deplored, and the proposal for meetings such as this met with a quick and encouraging response. It may be enough to quote passages from letters addressed to the present writer by two distinguished members of the secular clergy. The one wrote:

The proposal to hold such a meeting as you suggest is to me a delightful one. It is a step that should have been taken long ago; and, if realized, will, I am certain, be productive of much practical good.

And the other:

I do not think anyone will approve your idea more completely than I do. I think our general isolation is deplorable. . . . For years I have longed for some *Alliance des grands séminaires*, but we are still going on in practically complete ignorance of what anyone is doing besides ourselves. Then what an advantage it should be to meet men who are engaged on the same specific work as ourselves. I think it will usher in a new epoch in our professional work.

It is not too much to say that this glowing forecast is on its way to fulfilment. It is a help to discuss questions of method with others engaged in a similar work of teaching; questions of pedagogy will doubtless be handled in some paper or other at every Conference, and form the subject of much informal conversation. Questions concerning the matter of Catholic teaching, the present state of some particular subject, the issues involved, the best line to take in dealing with it, and so forth, offer a larger, and indeed an inexhaustible field for consideration and discussion. Then, as has been said so often and so emphatically at these meetings, the very fact of coming together means so much. There is the encouragement and confidence derived from intercourse with fellow-workers; the feeling that we are a strong body fighting in a great cause; there is the charity and unity that cannot but react by degrees upon the spirit of the students, and so of the clergy in general, secular and regular; there is the opportunity of consulting those whose opinion we may well be anxious to have, whether about books or doctrines or aught else; there is, in fact, all that is summed up in that great old saying, union is strength. And this benefit is derived in an atmosphere of geniality and good fellowship that makes a pleasure of what one almost feels to have become a duty.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the scope and purpose of the Conference is actually confined to those who are teaching. The strictly pedagogic question of method, as has been seen, is very far from exhausting the field of its survey—and even in regard of this, as a matter of fact, some valuable contributions have come from those whose only experience has been that of the taught! But there are, of course, many priests who keep up their interest in the whole or part of their ecclesiastical studies, and attendance at the Conference will evidently prove a great help to them in this matter; here, once more, one can already speak from a certain amount of actual experience. Some of the laity too have something to contribute, as has also been proved already in actual fact, and there are some who have devoted sufficient time and trouble to these studies to find it worth their while to be present. Questions of science and art, of economics and music, naturally come to the mind as those in which one would most expect valuable contributions from the expert laity.

There is also a benefit to be expected for the Church at large, not only the indirect benefit which is the certain result of any profitable development in the Catholic centres of study, but also the direct possibility and hope of some common action, chiefly, we may suppose, in the way of writing, although something might be done in other directions. If, as is so much to be desired, the Conference becomes the focus, the clearing-house (if we change the figure) of the best and most representative Catholic thought, it will be able to organize a powerful and well-directed effort to expound and defend the Catholic position, and to give to such an effort effective backing. In this way it may come to make its influence strongly felt, not so much, perhaps, among the masses themselves—not, of course, that we have anything but admiration for the workers in that wider field, itself so much in need of being further cultivated—as among those who influence the masses, who in universities and colleges and elsewhere, as well as in books and periodicals, not to speak of the daily press, are forming the minds of the younger generation and of the old, and only too often on the almost unconscious assumption that the Church stands for all that is obsolete and "reactionary." The Conference may well prove a beginning—for a beginning has hardly yet been made—of dealing with this vast and deep-rooted evil, by presenting

Catholic truth to the non-Catholic student and the scholar, and to the learned and educational world at large, as the supreme and final expression of reason, no less than of faith.

These are great hopes, to be realized at the best but slowly; but it will need high ideals and a clear purpose to carry the work through and develop it to the full. Meanwhile it must be enough to say that the work of the Conference will always be carried on in due subordination to the guidance of the English Hierarchy, as expressed to them through His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop. A special source of pleasure and encouragement to the last Conference was the presence of His Lordship the Bishop of Brentwood, who thus set a seal upon the solid support which he had given the first meeting as Rector of Wonersh. He took a welcome and most helpful share in the proceedings, a share which all hope and believe he will not renounce in the future.

C. L.

---

THE MANSFIELD MANIFESTO.

WE always watch with sympathetic interest the numbers of the *Constructive Quarterly*, a periodical devoted to the promotion of Christian Unity, as they come out; still always with a certain regret because we cannot but feel that, precious as is the end its promoters have in view, they prevent it from being advanced by the rule they have made for themselves of discouraging the interchange of argumentation and criticism between their different contributors. This rule was well-intended, we have no doubt, as a precaution against the heated and hostile feelings which are so liable to attend religious controversy, but this, it seems to us, might readily be obviated by the persistent cultivation of a friendly spirit among the disputants, whereas, as experience proves, if the advocates of the different solutions are not allowed to get together by criticizing one another, nothing in the way of enlightenment and approach can result. The different articles become mere monologues which are without any perceptible influence, and the whole reunion movement tends to perish of apathy. A few months ago, the sympathizers with the movement got in touch with Benedict XV., and, for the moment, there seemed a prospect of something more practical being done. We ventured at the time to counsel them to take advantage of the Pope's suggestion that, though it was difficult for Catholics to join in the movement under

present conditions, if the projectors would take as the basis of their own scheme an examination of Catholicism as a system which did succeed in securing unity of faith and communion on a very wide scale, and would institute a friendly discussion of the various points of its constitution, Catholics then could cordially join and could be of immense use, owing to their full knowledge and experience of the subject matter. The suggestion, however, was not taken up, and the conduct of the magazine relapsed into its old and, as it seems to us, hopeless groove, each writer apparently thinking only of reasserting his own position, and not caring in the least whether any one else agreed with him. And to judge from the two latest issues it looks as if the good ship Reunion was, in consequence, about to break up on the rocks.

In the September number appeared a "Mansfield Manifesto," which, as a December contributor puts it, "brought about a perfect storm on both sides." In September, Dr. Selbie, the Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, gave an account of a Conference held at that college in January, 1920, consisting of "some fifty men representing all shades of opinion in the Anglican and in the Free Churches," who, "at the end of three days' discussion," reached the following *unanimous* findings, subsequently published and sent to the authorities of all the Churches concerned:

We are in entire accord in our common recognition of the fact that the denominations to which we severally belong are equally, as corporate groups, within the one Church of Christ; and the efficacy of their ministrations is verified in the history of the Church. We believe that all dealings between them should be conducted on the basis of this Recognition, which is fundamental to any approach towards the realization of the Re-united Church, for which we long and labour.

We agree that in order to give outward and visible expression to this principle of Recognition, the approach should be made along the following lines, as parts of one scheme:

- (1) Interchange of pulpits under due authority.
- (2) Subject to the same authority, mutual admission to the Lord's Table.
- (3) Acceptance by Ministers, serving in any one denomination, and who may desire it, of such authorization as shall enable them to minister fully and freely in the churches of other denominations; it being clearly stated that the purpose of this authorization is as above set forth, and

that it is not to be taken as ordination, or as repudiation of their previous status as Ministers in the Church Catholic of Christ.

Of course, this is a position which, from the Anglican standpoint, as generally stated, is perfectly wrong, for it would mean abandoning the sacramental character of the priesthood, as many of them understand it, and as it has been formally defined by the authorities of the Catholic Church over and over again. Hence we are not surprised to hear that the English Church Union's response to the proposals thus made was that

if the Anglican Church were to abandon (its present position) and were, by any official action, to recognize the equal validity of churches however constituted, ministries however conferred, and eucharists however celebrated, it would lose the Catholic status which it claims and its rights of appeal to the ancient and undivided Church.

We might further speculate how it was allowed to come about that certain men, representing all shades of opinion in the Anglican Church, were authorized to unite with Nonconformists, and, as far as it in them lay, to attempt to commit their Church to such sweeping and destructive Resolutions. But it is not worth while to do that, for every one knows that, in the ranks of those who are entitled to call themselves Church of England, one can find every variety of thought from almost complete Catholicism to extreme Rationalism, and accordingly one may assume that at Mansfield College "all shades" were not represented. But what service can such compromisers render to the cause of reunion? They may try to hinder it, if it shows no signs of taking the form they would themselves like, as it can never do; but in no other sense can they be relied upon to work for its realization.

On the other hand, we would still press upon all genuine reunionists the counsel we have given already. Study in due order, with the aids we have named, one Catholic dogma after another, and this process is certain to remove from your path many obstacles of which you are now conscious. Very many are taking that course, and with that experience, every day. Conviction cannot be forced, nor will any of us wish to force it. But you will be brought into touch with people who share the ideas you yourselves are drawn to; and at least you will have their prayers to count upon.

S. F. S.

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**Peace  
Delayed by  
Imperialism.**

On January 10th occurred the first anniversary of the Peace of Versailles which was meant to give legal and statutory effect to the results of the Great War. The year's interval has

shown too clearly that, although many minor results have been secured, the chief effect of all, the establishment of real peace, is as far off as ever. We are not referring to actual warfare, which for the moment has practically ceased, but to the entire absence of the spirit of peace from European counsels and policies. Many nations are only not fighting because they have not the means, or because they see no immediate advantage to be gained. If the object of the war was to destroy the war-m mentality, the reliance on personal might rather than on co-operative effort to achieve justice, it has signally failed. All the victorious nations are planning to be individually supreme in this or that branch of warfare. France has declared her intention of "gaining supremacy in the air as England holds it on the sea,"<sup>1</sup> whereas, in England, "every Cabinet Minister has publicly stated that we must be supreme in the air."<sup>2</sup> With these declarations of unabashed militarism before her, it is vain to expect Germany to follow the solemn advice of *The Times*<sup>3</sup> and to prove "her sincere sorrow for her past offences together with her sincere acceptance of the new settlement of the world and of her place in that settlement." There can be no new settlement of the world, in fact or in prospect, so long as the nations are ostentatiously competing in armaments and showing that they do not trust their security to the organized good-will in the world but to shifty alliances and preponderance of force. The League of Nations must be made a reality or we must frankly give up any attempt to limit by enactments the military power of Germany or any other nation. It is, as we have often said, Imperialism that is the solvent of the world's peace. The war destroyed four Empires, but the spirit of Imperialism, the desire or claim to dominate other peoples in one's own interest, that will not be destroyed until the Allies set the example by purging their practice, as well as their professions, of all that savours of the evil thing.

**Is the new  
World-Order to be  
Established?**

It is plain that the German reluctance to disarm is dictated by the prospect, which no great and self-respecting nation can be asked to face, of being impotent in the world's councils for an indefinite time. And it is equally plain that she cannot be

<sup>1</sup> Speech of Under Secretary of State for Aeronautics, Oct. 9, 1920.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to *The Times*, Jan. 11, 1921, from Mr. G. Holt Thomas.

<sup>3</sup> Leader, Jan. 11, 1921.

compelled—except at the cost of a prolonged and increasingly drastic occupation of her territory—for long to keep her army at the nominal figure of 100,000 men whilst other great nations are free to develop as they wish. The Supreme Council of the Allies met in Paris on January 24th to make one more attempt to solve the problem of European settlement. If they wish to succeed, they will have to decide finally between the old principles and the new: there can be no effective compromise. The world must organize for peace: there must be no more aggression and plans of conquest: the security and integrity of each Sovereign State, great or small, must be guaranteed and provided by the Society of States, just as the individual's security rests upon the community in which he lives. Disputes must be referred to the International Court of Law, instead of to the barbarous, wasteful, and uncertain arbitrament of the sword. That is the new settlement of the world of which *The Times* speaks. It is a complete departure from the old which was based on force, depended on alliances and the varying claims of national interest, and paid little regard to the welfare of humanity, in which, all the same, the welfare of each constituent is necessarily involved. What causes the present universal distrust and unrest is the patent discrepancy between the professions of statesmen and their acts. The anniversary of the Peace Treaty was also the birthday of the League of Nations, and various politicians of eminence took the occasion to renew their homage to the ideal embodied in the latter. But their deeds, their aims, their projects are all in the old grooves: their high ideals have degenerated into a scramble for markets. They cannot realize yet that individual prosperity makes for the prosperity of all. Least of all can they face the idea of their late foe becoming once more a powerful trade rival.

**The Right  
Attitude towards  
Germany.**

Yet it should be plain that only a rich and prosperous Germany can pay the indemnities imposed by the Treaty. And to grow rich is to grow strong. So the Reparations Commission, which has to present the Allies' bill by May of this year, will have to make up its mind whether to forgo much of the gold and goods which would ease the burdens of the Entente, or abandon the desire to keep in comparative weakness an enemy who will always in that capacity be a menace. Hitherto neither of these two incompatible aims has been pursued definitely and exclusively: it is to be hoped that in the interests of peace and humanity the Allies will concentrate on the first, fix the amount of indemnity Germany can pay and aid her in every way to discharge her obligations. To try to keep a country like Germany poor by artificial restrictions on trade and credit would be not

only futile in the long run but injurious to the true interests of the Allies themselves. Security can more surely be obtained by world-wide international agreement, fostered by mutual services, than by perpetuating national hatred and mistrust. "I prefer," said Lord Grey on January 4th, speaking of the League of Nations ideal, "the chance of Utopia to the certainty of destruction."

**What is Needed  
in Regard to the  
League of Nations.**

Our politicians are blaming America for the delay in attaining this ideal. The truth is the Americans are not yet convinced of the sincerity of the Allies in this matter, and, so far, little has been done, at Geneva or elsewhere, to bring about that conviction. There is need of repentance and change of heart on all sides. Although Germany more thoroughly than the other nations embraced the creed of militarism, and therefore must bear the chief guilt of the outbreak of war, still the pursuit of self-interest irrespective of justice has, for long years, been the common policy of all. The League of Nations must show that it is not a combination of the great nations to rule and exploit the little ones, and it must modify its constitution, if necessary, in order to make this plain: otherwise America will naturally and rightly hold aloof. In the Papal letter for August, 1917, and the more recent Encyclical of Whitsuntide last year, are laid down the principles on which a true fellowship of nations can and should be founded, and the Pope promises to use the powerful and world-wide organization of the Catholic Church in support of such a fellowship. The Catholic Church by its very nature and constitution is admirably calculated to prevent patriotism running to seed and developing into chauvinism. The true Catholic, whilst thoroughly loyal to his native land, will also remember that he shares with all other nationals the potential citizenship of Heaven.

**Can any Nation  
now Command  
the Sea?**

The experts have not yet decided "What is the use of a Battleship?", although *The Times* gives them unstinted space for discussion. But meanwhile another and more fundamental question is being mooted, and Lord Rothermere has actually dared to suggest<sup>1</sup> that as a result of the war, and the changed conditions which it has brought about, it is no longer possible for Great Britain to aim at naval supremacy. His reasons are, first, that we cannot compete in wealth or resources with the United States, and that Power's naval programme if pursued will in a few years give it naval preponderance, and, second, that the war has proved that the submarine is henceforward, both for

<sup>1</sup> *Sunday Pictorial*, Jan. 9th.

defence and aggression, master of the situation. Hence the old standard by which power was measured,—the battleship—has gone. In any case, now that Germany has no fleet to speak of, and since France and Italy have long ago given up building battleships, the only nations making any claims to sea-supremacy are Great Britain, America, and Japan. The two latter are said to be building against each other: that remains to be seen: but in case of a war between Great Britain and either of them, a large fleet would be no use: it could not operate effectively in the Pacific: it could not really blockade the eastern American seaboard: it could not protect Canada. The safety of the overseas members of the British Commonwealth can no longer be secured by Britain "commanding the seas," nor is such command any longer necessary. All requisite protection and all needful policing of the Seven Seas can be obtained by agreements within the League of Nations between the great naval Powers. And no large vessels are needed for this work. It is safe to say that no more £9,000,000 battleships will be built. Yet two forces, as Lord Rothermere points out, will oppose the transference of naval effort from big surface vessels to submarines—the flag officers of the Navy and the great private naval dockyards and armour-plate manufacturers; for under the new conditions the occupation of these various interests will certainly be gone.

**Imperialism  
at  
Work.**

When, for the security of British interests in the Pacific, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was formed, it was objected to by many on racial and religious grounds. We do not think that these motives should prevent a renewal of the Alliance, which is drawing near its term. Our objections to that renewal are more fundamental, arising from the fact that all particular alliances are contrary to the new spirit, which projects like the League of Nations are endeavouring to introduce into international affairs, and more particularly from the fact that the treatment of Korea by Japan, condoned though it has been by the European Powers, is frankly and brutally "imperialistic." Japan has treated and is treating that unfortunate nation in the worst spirit of Prussianism. It originally got a foothold there at the end of the nineteenth century by driving out the Chinese and assuming their place as suzerain Power. In 1904 Japan solemnly guaranteed the independence and integrity of Korea and its dynasty; in 1905, with the connivance of Russia, England, and America, it established a Protectorate, which gradually paved the way, littered besides with torn up treaties, to formal annexation in 1910, Europe and America, for various private reasons, making no protest against this robbery. Of course the Koreans

objected. A mild, inoffensive people easily won to Christianity,<sup>1</sup> they nevertheless deeply resent foreign rule, especially when directed, as the rule of Japan is now directed, to the destruction of their nationality, language, and indigenous civilization. But just as they had appealed in vain to President Roosevelt in 1905, so in 1919 the Versailles Conference, full of professed zeal for the interests of small nations, refused even to hear the Korean delegate. And now Japan, without a word of protest from her European Allies, is "putting down" Korean aspirations for independence with savage barbarity. According to the accounts of American and Canadian missionaries, churches, schools and houses are burned, men shot without trial, the inhabitants given over to torture and plunder. Why is not Korea, an entirely distinct nation from Japan, to be allowed her own national life? It has a compact, well-defined territory of 93,000 square miles (about twice the size of Ireland, a country which naturally occurs to the mind in this connection), and a population of nearly 20 million people. It is capable of self-government if justly treated or let alone. Why has it been forcibly annexed and forcibly held by its brigand neighbour? A *Times* reviewer of Mr. McKenzie's *Korea's Fight for Freedom*, supplies the expected answer—"Because control of the peninsula is strategically vital to the Japanese Empire,"—the old militarist plea, which would justify France in annexing England, or Germany in annexing Belgium and Holland, or Russia in seizing Constantinople, or any other Naboth in seizing his neighbour's vineyard. This is what "Imperialism" naturally and inevitably leads to. With Japan a member of the League of Nations, and professing a belief in the new world order, what wonder is it that America looks askance at that organization!

**Friendly  
Confederation  
the Ideal.**

But that is no reason why America should not attempt something better or insist on such reform of the League as would make it a real Brotherhood, interested in the establishment of justice as the only lasting groundwork of peace, and persuaded that peace based on justice is the highest good of humanity. The future President has, we are glad to see, declared his intention of striving for this end. We may take it that he will have his people's support. The common interests of the world are worth some national self-sacrifice to secure. But it is the common people, voting solidly against violence and injustice, that must secure them. Politicians are not to be trusted, nor, as a whole, is the Press. Behind both is the hidden hand of "finance," an influence universally acknowledged but never clearly detected in its working. Let the voters distrust those who foster national

<sup>1</sup> See "Korea," by T. Gavan Duffy; *THE MONTH*, April, 1920, p. 333.

hatreds, those who predict another war, those who speak of "inevitable antagonisms," who raise the spectre of "surplus populations" and apply the shibboleths of Darwinism to the conduct of free and reasonable beings. One such alarmist, Mr. M'Clure from the States, has lately been pointing out the menace from Japan with its teeming population and its low standards of living—the old Yellow Peril bogey. The fact is there is no pressure of population in Japan, and if there were it can find relief in Formosa or the valley of the Amazon. And one may hope that the Japanese militarists, those responsible for the plunder of Korea and the present naval expansion, will not always be in power.

**Un-Christian  
Practices in  
Ireland.**

It is not easy to speak about Ireland without saying too much or too little. The duty of the Press is to soothe not to exacerbate public feeling. Emotion clouds the judgment, and never was the operation of calm reason more necessary than to-day. Of political issues this is not the place to speak; our task is to assert and uphold the moral ideal. On that plea we have condemned reprisals, in the sense previously explained of a competitor in crime, the punishment of murder by murder, arson by arson. The law of the land is at one with the moral law on that point. At the late Belfast Assizes, Mr. Justice Pim, a Protestant Judge of the High Court, declared—

There is no such thing as legal reprisals. The law will not recognize such an act by any man, no matter how angry he may be, and the men who have broken and entered, the men who have assaulted are guilty before the law of assault; when they have killed they are guilty of murder, and when they have burned they are guilty of arson.

It may be urged that the Irish Government did after a while forbid its troops to practise reprisals, but the prohibition had little effect, giving the impression that either the Government was not in earnest or that the auxiliaries were out of hand. Nor has the limiting of reprisals to those authorized by military authority had much effect in diminishing the other kind. Whatever may be said of the end in view, Christian morality can never sanction these ways of attaining it. Punishment can be justly inflicted only on those proved guilty, not on their friends or their neighbours or their countrymen, unless these too are proved guilty of aiding and abetting. The needs of war excuse many rough and ready processes, but even they cannot be justly applied, save by forms of law. Nor in any case do they abrogate the Ten Commandments. We cannot too strongly reprobate the cold-blooded massacre of the officers in Dublin on November 14th,

whatever may have been their record in the eyes of their assassins, and all similar acts of outrage upon servants of the Government, but we must reprobate equally strongly the continuous assassinations of alleged Sinn Feiners throughout a large portion of the country without any form of law by the forces of the Crown. And when these forces add torture to their murderings, when they treat the untried prisoners in their concentration camps with Hunnish barbarity, when they rob freely the population they profess to be protecting from the terrorism of the "murder gangs," the most unbending upholder of British rule must condemn their proceedings as a black stain upon his country's honour. No one now defends the brutalities by which the uprising of '98 was provoked: we fear that unless the Government abandons the present methods of "frightfulness" in Ireland, historians will see little difference between 1797 and 1920.

**Reprisals  
Condemned by  
History.**

We may recall that reprisals of this indiscriminate form were attempted by military order during the Boer War, but the attempt so outraged public opinion in this country that the order was recalled in ten days. Mr. Lloyd George, who now finds excuses for the policy, denounced it vigorously at the time in the House of Commons (December 15, 1900).

In regard to military reprisals [he said] nothing is gained by making a man desperate. It is a silly, foolish, iniquitous policy to burn his farm, ruin his property, and bring his family to the grave. It is not a military question at all; it is a question of understanding the ordinary influences which govern human nature.

The lapse of twenty years has blunted, not only the Premier's conscience but that of the public generally, for although the Labour Party and various organizations and papers belonging to the Opposition group have denounced the policy in vogue, there has been no general protest, and reprisals of all sorts, official and unofficial, are still the chief weapon with which the Government aims at restoring order in Ireland. We have said that the process recalls the practices which provoked the desperate rebellion of 1798. It is noteworthy that, in 1797, Sir Ralph Abercromby had to be sent over to Ireland to restore discipline amongst the troops there. Lecky describes the work he had before him:<sup>1</sup>

Abercromby's object . . . was to bring back the army into the limits of legality, and to put a stop to the scandalous outrages which were constantly occurring, if not under the direct prompting, at least with the tacit connivance of

<sup>1</sup> *Ireland in the 18th Century*, Vol. V. p. 202.

Government officials. . . . The outrages were of different kinds . . . a large class, of which the burning of houses formed the most conspicuous example, were illegal acts of violence deliberately carried out in places where murders had been committed or where arms had been concealed, and deliberately screened by men in authority from the intervention of the law courts.

There is much more of the same lamentable sort in Lecky, who details the defeat of Abercromby's efforts, the denial in England of the existence of such abominations and the tacit approval of them by Dublin Castle. It is this alarming repetition of the very worst features in the relations between the two countries that has moved staunch Unionists like Lord Robert Cecil to sever connection with the Government. It is not too much to hope that men and women of all creeds and parties, in Ireland as well as here, will come at last to realize that a good cause is only prejudiced by unrighteous methods.

**Unemployment  
and  
its Causes.**

The vast majority of people in this country and in every other depend for their living upon work. But owing to the operation of the present capitalist system there is not enough work to go round. Last year the cry was all for production, more production. Now we are told that we are suffering from over-production: supply has over-passed demand: therefore many of the producers must lapse into idleness. Thus we have the spectacle of a slowly starving "proletariat" kept in bare existence by doles, yet faced with shops and warehouses which are over-stocked and bursting with goods. Why cannot the goods be sold to those that need them? Because the latter cannot pay the price necessary to make a profit for the seller and thus enable *him* to live. Therefore, to get the trade current moving again we must try to reduce the costs of production—the price of the raw material and of the machinery employed, rent of premises, the wages of those who operate the machinery, the salaries of those who superintend them, the wages again of those who distribute the finished goods, the profits of the retailer, the dividends on the money invested, the reserve for deterioration. A cheapening in one or more of these items will render possible the lowering of price to the consumer. Will it actually lower prices? Not necessarily. The decrease in wages and salaries may be absorbed by an increased dividend or a higher profit for the retailer. The only sensible way in which to restore the flow of trade is for all the interests concerned to meet and determine what amount of return on capital or profit on sale or wage for work is fair for all parties, a decent livelihood being the standard. But there are no signs as yet of

this sensible proceeding. Labour stood aloof from the Government Committee on Unemployment at the end of the year. Otherwise we may presume the latter would not have produced its extraordinary scheme of short time, which would not remedy the evil but only check the further growth of unemployment. If those still lucky enough to be employed are put on short time they will not produce so much, and thus over-production will be lessened. But clearly there is no provision in this scheme for employing those already out of work. That would intensify the very over-production it is intended to alleviate. The plan has been universally scoffed by the workers, many of whom throughout the country are already on short time and short pay.

**The Wage-  
System on its  
Trial.**

The workers see in it merely a plan to reduce wages, and, to do them justice, many of the great employers make no secret of their view that this is necessary. But there is no suggestion that profits should be reduced, and naturally the workers are asking—Why not? Have they any guarantee that lowering wages will lower prices? Prices went up long before there were wage increases, and may stay up or rise higher even if wage-costs are reduced. Why should the pinch of trade depression be chiefly felt by those who are least able to bear it? It will be seen that the whole wage-system is on its trial, tried by the standard of common human welfare. If it necessarily results, as we see it resulting to-day, in the comparative security and competence of the few and the continued insecurity and indigence of the many, then, in the name of justice and common humanity, it must be radically modified or entirely scrapped. We have no sympathy with those who prate in the language of an exploded philosophy of the "iron laws of economics" as alone responsible for the misery of the worker. The "laws" of economics are much less rigid and intractable than those of gravitation or gas-expansion. Yet man has successfully trained the latter to serve his needs.

**Pope Leo  
and the True  
Remedy.**

Labour conditions have not altered, although their drawbacks have become more accentuated, since Leo XIII. made his masterly analysis of them and pointed out the remedies

for their defects. The Pope deplored the abolition of the ancient Guilds and the resultant disorganization of labour; the elimination of religion from public life which destroyed the one bond between rich and poor; the growth of "rapacious usury," his name for exorbitant profits of every sort; the custom of working by contract, in other words the wage-system, as we now have it; and finally trusts and combines, "the concentra-

tion of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals." Nothing has been done in the interval to remove these five sources of industrial unrest, unless, perhaps, that Labour is now better organized. But religious solidarity is even more distant, and neither the law nor the public conscience sets any bounds to the rate of profit, or the concentration of productive wealth. In default of Christian teaching and influences, it would appear that the present system can only be destroyed by violence, and the Pope gives the reason.

On the one hand [he says] there is the party which holds power because it holds wealth; which has in its grasp the whole of labour and trade; which manipulates for its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is even [the Holy Father might more truly have written "overwhelmingly"] represented in the Councils of the State. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, broken-down and suffering, and ever ready for disturbance.

Catholics at least can do their part in averting revolution by imbibing and preaching the Pope's social doctrine, which aims in brief at securing the dignity and independence of the worker by overthrowing the monopoly of capital.

**Our Loss  
in  
Father Plater.**

One to whom more than any other man Catholics in England owe their sense of what is wanting in our present economic system and what should be done to repair it has, alas! been lately taken from us in the plenitude of his powers and influence. Our readers will lament the sudden and premature death on January 21st of Father Charles Plater, one of the founders of the Catholic Social Guild, and ever since its main support and inspiration. His assuredly will be the happiness that belongs to those "who have understanding concerning the needy and the poor," for zeal for the welfare, spiritual and temporal, of the worker was the main inspiration of his short but most fruitful career, if it was not indeed one main cause of its tragically early close. We trust that the influence of his example may continue to guide and stimulate the Catholic Social Guild, whose members will doubtless feel that they cannot better preserve and venerate his memory than by renewed efforts for the extension and prosperity of the institution to which he devoted so much of his life.

**German Poverty  
Causes  
Unemployment.**

As an illustration of the price to be paid even for a successful war, it is well to note that one of the causes of our widespread unemployment is the bankruptcy of Europe, friends and foes alike, and the competition already begun between our workers

here and those on the Continent, who are forced by starvation to work for longer hours on half the British pay and therefore can produce much cheaper goods. And the policy of "making Germany pay" has the effect of increasing the intensity of her competition and further destroying our European markets. We hope that the workers are taking account of this fact, for it will help them to understand, what our politicians seem unable to grasp, that the general prosperity of the nations depends upon the individual prosperity of each, and that the immediate material advantages of war are sure to be neutralized in the long run. Hence the advisability of finding an effective substitute.

**The Divorce Peril Again.** Lord Buckmaster, the champion of easy divorce, is not deterred by the failure of his legislation to sap the foundations of family life. That, we hasten to add, is not his Lordship's intention: it is only what history and reason alike proclaim to be the inevitable results of his proposals. A recent article of his not only reveals his purpose of resuming his attack upon marriage but also shows us how completely this prominent man has rejected Christianity as a rule of morality. Speaking of concubinage, our ex-Lord Chancellor thus improves upon St. Paul:

It is a doctrine [not intrinsically immoral but] full of peril: a doctrine which gives full scope to the unprincipled and selfish: yet great men have acknowledged its power and not a few have followed its prompting.

Without, of course, being any the less great. And after this palliation of vice he goes on to state the reasons for his measure.

It is not marriage that has failed but marriages. [Yet he would weaken marriage!] Lives that have seemed united at twenty-five became wide apart as the poles in a few years; temperaments that were once in harmony grow as incompatible as virtue and vice. Selfishness, vanity, greed, extravagance, and infidelity enter to separate common sympathies: the symbols of unity become a mockery: and mutual life sinks to inconceivable degradation.

Therefore, cast them loose, and let these selfish, vain, greedy, extravagant, and unfaithful partners carry their vices into another union; let those variable "temperaments" seek another transient harmony: put a premium on want of principle and instability of character: do not isolate but spread the plague! The ex-Lord Chancellor may be learned in law but he has still

something to learn in morality. For he wants to enable the "unfortunate parties," legally and indissolubly married though they are, "to return to a *clean* existence"!

**The Jesuits**

**a  
Secret Society.**

We credited Freemasonry with more sense than has recently been exhibited by the Editor of *The Freemason* in admitting to his pages a series of articles on "Secret Societies in the Roman Catholic Church," by a certain Bro. Dudley Wright. The article in the issue for December 4th is devoted to the "most important" of these secret societies, "that great and wonderful organization, the Society of Jesus," and it lowers the journal immediately in point of intelligence and honesty to the level of *The Rock* or *The Protestant Woman*. For Bro. Dudley Wright knows nothing of his subject and shows no signs of having taken even ordinary means of dissipating his ignorance. He says the Society "consists not only of the clergy—and of these there are two classes, professed and unprofessed—but also of various branches of lay-associations and societies." "There are also," he goes on, "various sodalities, meeting ostensibly for devotional practices and religious purposes, but which meet in secret conclave, initiated members only being admitted." Bro. Wright then describes, more or less accurately, the Sodality of Our Lady, known as the "Prima Primaria," but gives no reason, beyond his mere assurance, for considering it an integral part of the Society of Jesus, or reckoning either amongst societies which are secret. Later on, however, he states on the authority of Saint Simon, who in this matter is no authority at all and himself produces no evidence, that "the Jesuits constantly admit the laity, even married, into their Company." The Constitutions of the Society are open to the inspection of Bro. Wright. The Fathers of the Society are ready to answer his questions if he has any real desire to know the facts. They above all men would be glad to know on what grounds he ranks the Society with the Freemasons as a "secret" organization. If he meant to bring off a "Tu quoque" he should surely have got hold of the "Monita Secreta," of which he will find a full account in *THE MONTH* for January 1893 and August 1901.

**The Appeal  
of  
the C.T.S.**

We should rather have referred him to the C.T.S. pamphlet *The Secret Instructions of the Jesuits*, but that, like many others, is, owing to the iniquity of the times, out of print. In this connection we must express our unfeigned pleasure at the revival of efforts, evidenced by an appeal in the Press, to put this most important organization on a satisfactory footing. Extremely valuable as has been the work done in the past by the

C.T.S., due, as all the world knows, mainly to the energy and devotion of Mr. James Britten, it has never by any means exhausted its possibilities. And this is due, let us state it very frankly, to lack of the support which it ought to have had from the Catholic body, clergy and laity alike. If the C.T.S. has not a series of pamphlets covering every point of Catholic doctrine, every historical and controversial issue, the lives of eminent Catholics, saints and others, devotional practices and liturgical services—in short, a complete Catholic armoury of literature, well-written, accurate, clear, persuasive, attractive, and *cheap*, it is because of Catholic apathy, past and present. The membership of the C.T.S. is between two and three thousand, out of a Catholic population in Great Britain of 2,460,000. The number of British clergy, bishops and priests, whose chief business it is to administer the means of grace and to disseminate Catholic truth, is 4,600: of these only a small proportion belong to the C.T.S. The number of churches and chapels in the island is roughly 2,300; for the Society's cheaper publications the church-door forms the chief means of distribution. If only ten copies of each pamphlet were taken by each possible centre, editions of 20,000 could be printed, and sold without loss at a penny. We are cursed by an infidel Press. Our Catholic mentality is constantly exposed to the insidious attacks of false ideas and principles. And, it must be confessed, many of our body are ill-instructed in the details of their Faith. The furtherance of this work, the multiplication and spread of Catholic literature, is practically essential to the maintenance of the Faith in this country. A few wealthy persons have the power of putting it on a strong and progressive financial footing: the clergy have the power of increasing its membership indefinitely. The benefit, individual and social, is so obvious and so great that one wonders whether mere apathy alone can account for the neglect complained of. If there are people who feel that the C.T.S. does not merit confidence or support, they would greatly assist reform or dissolve misapprehension by making their views known to the Committee, either privately or through the Press.

THE EDITOR.

### III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

#### CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Assumption of Our Lady, Definability of** [P. J. Toner in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Jan., 1921, p. 16].

**Bible, Attitude of Church towards** : Miss Deanesly's attack rebutted [H. Pope, O.P., in *Dublin Review*, Jan.—Mar., 1921, p. 60 : *Tablet*, Jan. 22, 1921, p. 107].

**Church, The Marks of the** [M. S. Smith in *Homiletic Review*, Jan., 1921, p. 357].

**Civil Authority, Source of** [Prof. O'Rahilly in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Oct., 1920, p. 301 : Dr. J. Fitzpatrick, *Ibid.*, Jan., 1921, p. 1 : *Month*, Feb., 1921, p. 159].

**Hunger Strike, Summary of case for and against** [J. Kelleher in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Jan., 1921, p. 47].

**Mass in the New Code** [S. Woywod, O.F.M., in *Homiletic Review*, Dec., 1920, p. 182].

**Psycho-Analysis, Catholic View of** [E. B. Barrett in *Month*, Feb., 1921, p. 97].

**Sacraments** : Natural and Supernatural [G. E. Biddle in *Blackfriars*, Jan., 1921, p. 591].

**Virginia Mother, The** [Dr. Arendzen in *Catholic Gazette*, Jan., 1921, p. 13].

#### CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

**Catholicism in Russia in XIX. Century** [*Civiltà Cattolica*, Jan. 15, 1921, p. 117].

**Catholic Progress in U.S.A.** [T. Maynard in *Blackfriars*, Jan., 1921, p. 577].

**Cinema Control by Catholics in New Zealand** [D. H. Hurley, S.M., in *America*, Jan. 8, 1921, p. 285].

**Faith and Free Thought** [Jos. Rickaby, S.J., in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Jan., 1921, p. 20].

**History-Study in U.S.A. in Catholic defence** [J. J. Walsh in *America*, Jan. 15, 1921, p. 301].

**Lambeth Encyclical** : General reception of [*Tablet*, Jan. 22 and 29, 1921, p. 101].

**Middle Ages, The maligned** [M. F. X. Millar, S.J., in *America*, Dec. 11, 1920, p. 177].

**Muir's History of England, Protestantism of Professor R.** ["Historicus" in *Blackfriars*, Jan., 1921].

**Preas, How to counteract evil influence of** [A. H. Atteridge in *Month*, Feb., 1921, p. 111].

#### POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Bellarmino, The Decree upon the Heroic Virtue of Cardinal** [*Civiltà Cattolica*, Jan. 13, 1921, p. 161].

**Capitalism, The Peril to** [H. Lucas in *Universe*, Jan. 14, 1921, p. 15].

**Confederation of Catholic "Intellectuals," Proposed** [Hepp and Massis in *Revue des Jeunes*, Jan. 25, 1921, p. 203].

**Guild Socialism** [A. F. in *Universe*, Jan. 7 and 14, 1921. Leader].

**Holy Places, The British and the** [G. Hunt, O.F.M., in *Tablet*, Jan. 15, 1921 : *Universe*, Jan. 14, 1921].

**Limpias, Psychophysical Explanation of Prodigies at** [M. Rubio Cercas in *La Ciencia Tomista*, Jan.—Feb., 1921, p. 20].

[CORRECTION : The Publishers of "Kino's Historical Memoir," reviewed in our December issue, are the Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, O., U.S.A. : not the Charles H. Clark Co.]

# REVIEWS

## I—NO LOOSE STONES<sup>1</sup>

THEOLOGY expressed in essay-form is apt to be vague; a vivid style may be preferred to cogency in argument, and the author is tempted to write around his subject. Especially when several writers collaborate in a volume of theological essays is it difficult to find the greatest common measure of the Faith they hold. Yet Oxford is famous for its theological essays and essayists, and we welcome with delight this first venture of Catholic graduates in these particular lists. An earlier volume of this sort, the famous *Lux Mundi*, produced the impression that its authors were trying to hold on to the Christian faith in spite of the dictates of reason; they remained Christians through lack of logic. In our own generation, *Foundations*, another attempt to find a basis for belief, showed that the process of disintegration had gone further; the authors no longer look backward towards the Faith once delivered to the Saints, for Christianity turns out to be still in the making; personal experience and the use of the inductive method will produce a religion abreast of modern requirements. Both these famous books aimed at being a re-statement of the Faith: in both there is something vitally lacking, viz., the supernatural.

The volume before us challenges comparison with those mentioned. Six Catholic Oxford graduates have come forward, not to restate or accommodate the Creed to the exigencies of the "modern mind," but "to set forth the doctrine of the Faith they hold, in language intelligible to the ordinary educated reader." For them, the essay-combination is stripped of its dangers; as Catholics they all hold the same Faith, which they have no need to prove, as they have behind their statement the age-long tradition of the Church.

In the Introduction, Father R. Knox explains their aim. To-day men are tired of expediency, in religion as in politics; they want a standard by which to live and think; dissatisfaction with man-made creeds makes them listen for the voice of one "speaking with authority." To them he says in effect, "Catholicism, to you an unknown Faith, may offer you what you are wanting. We are convinced it must, for it is a supernatural religion. Study it and see what you think of it."

<sup>1</sup> *God and the Supernatural: a Catholic Statement of the Christian Faith.* Edited by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. London: Longmans. Pp. ix, 346. Price, 15s net.

Father Martindale, in an essay which is the key to the book, insists that this notion of the supernatural is essential to any understanding of Catholicism, and marks it off from what has come to be called Christianity. He reminds the practical man of the visionary strain in him, that he has within him a possibility of a higher, fuller life, a free gift of God, the rejection of which we call the Fall, its restoration the Redemption. The essayist, we think, has succeeded in his aim, "to make an outline-map of the Catholic country." The reader should herein get a glimpse of something peculiar to Catholicism, something which makes this book intelligible; but in case it is only a glimpse, he will be well advised "to read this section patiently and carefully; to read, next, the rest of the book: finally, to re-read this chapter."

After this outline-map comes the treatment of God, of man and of God's purpose for man. In "The Idea of God," Father D'Arcy, while asserting that Revelation is "a response to an overwhelming practical need," protests against the Liberal claim that it is a human message, the meaning of which grows by a process of evolution. It is this supposition which vitiates the corresponding essay in *Lux Mundi*. In seeking to understand God, "the best effort of a man is but a shooting at a mark beyond his range, and grace and revelation are needed to strengthen the hand and make the mark clearer." He considers the idea of God and His nature, then turns to the problem of the relation between God and the world. Pantheism and the Finite God are both found wanting. To preserve at once the transcendence and the immanence of God we must have recourse to a unique relation. Explain it? "The Book of God no man can write: he must lay down his pen. This is the streak of Agnosticism in Catholic theology." Mr. C. Dawson treats of the Nature and Destiny of man, who belongs to the spiritual, as well as to the material world; for materialism is disproved by our conviction of moral values. The conflict between the animal and the spirit in man is ended by the spiritualization of man's whole nature, its re-creation in Christ. From the Christian standpoint life consists in a re-formation, by the operation of the Divine Spirit through faith and love. He argues with St. Anthony that such a life is not unnatural. But this can be realized only by effort: live the Christian life and nature will not be destroyed, but restored to the union with God, which is its destiny.

There is an obvious objection to the acceptance of this almighty and all-loving God. Mr. Watkin, therefore, offers

a solution, necessarily incomplete, of the Problem of Evil. He lays stress on what is often neglected, the vast amount of good in the world. He finds the best solution in the law of struggle in and through solidarity. "Our struggle against evil is to be fought by no solitary combat, but in the army of Christ, in the solidarity of His mystical body. . . . God could have bestowed the prize of victory without the struggle; but the victory He could not bestow."

Father Cuthbert, the Editor, has undertaken the task of showing God's purpose at work in the Incarnation and Redemption. At this point the gulf which divides this book from *Foundations* becomes very plain. There we are told not to ask the question, Was Christ God? but to study Christ and so learn what God is, leaving aside all preconceptions. Father Cuthbert reminds us that "the Catholic belief in Christ is not put forth as a philosophical conclusion, but as a revelation from God to man." He starts from the Gospel of St. John and shows us the Person of Christ as the principle of life. The subject is a difficult one, and the ordinary reader will find it hard to follow the first of the essays; but in the second we have a clearer exposition of Redemption as the supreme act of God's love, a re-establishment of human nature through fellowship with Christ, Who emptied Himself that He might heal what He assumed. We, through His life in us, are capable of repentance, and so of participation in the Redemption He wrought. The doctrine of solidarity with Christ is again to the fore, and is developed by Mr. Watkin in his essay on "The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ." He makes good use of St. Paul to show the work of Redemption and the life of Christ continuing in the Church. We think, however, that the introduction of the phrases "body" and "soul of the Church" into such an essay will only lead to bewilderment. More stress might have been laid on the visible Church as the seat of supreme authority, in order to show the Catholic conception of the Church as distinct from non-Catholic vagueness on the subject.

No better way of showing what the supernatural means in practice could have been chosen than to treat, as Father Martindale has done, of the Sacraments. With deft touch he depicts in each Sacrament "the one great aim, the implanting, developing, and, if necessary, restoring a superhuman life in man; and one general method, the mating and the co-operation of the material and the spiritual." Then, in the closing essay of the book, he answers the question, so much discussed to-day, "And what of the life after this?" In the

light of what has been said earlier, he deals with the objections to hell, and, to correct crude conceptions of Heaven, he tries to say something of the Beatific Vision. It is a fit ending, an apocalypse or revelation of what the Christian life can and should mean, a vision and a spur to all, Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

In this summary, lengthy though it be, we have failed to give an adequate idea of the matter of this most important volume and still less of its style; we hope, at any rate, that we may persuade some of our readers to go to the book itself. There was room for it, and we wish it the success it deserves, if only for the sympathy the essayists show for views other than their own. If we may be permitted a grumble, the index should be left out or improved; it is little else than a string of names, and it is difficult to see why many, e.g., Dr. Rashdall, Epstein, and Augustus John, find a place there.

## 2—RELIGION MADE IN GERMANY<sup>1</sup>

“WE will not refute you; we will explain you,” said a dogmatic agnostic of the Victorian age. To explain historic Christianity, and to explain it away, has been the main purpose of German criticism. The patient labour, the accumulated knowledge, the intellectual acumen and power concentrated on this aim are acknowledged and duly appreciated by Père Lagrange. He is not one of those short-sighted theologians who would dispose of German criticism with a sneer. We cannot be too confident as believers, but we may easily be over-confident as apologists. The first point is to understand the nature and direction of the attack. And so, this is an useful book for the hard-worked priest on the English Mission to-day. The “assured results of criticism” are taken for granted all around us by the modernizing Anglican divine, the journalist, and lastly, even by the man in the street. Père Lagrange will show how easily and surely these facile generalizations may be at once refuted and explained.

He follows the course of German thought from Luther, the author of revolt and disbelief, to the present day. The survey is wider therefore than Albert Schweitzer’s, in his *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, but practically the most useful part of this learned and shrewd criticism is that in which Père Lagrange examines the fashionable theories of eschatology and syncretism.

<sup>1</sup> *The Meaning of Christianity according to Luther and his followers in Germany.* By M. J. Lagrange, O.P. Translated by W. S. Reilly, SS. London : Longmans. Pp. 381. Price, 7s. 6d. net.

## SHORT NOTICES

### THEOLOGICAL.

A N important work, lately written by Rt. Rev. Wm. Schneider, Bishop of Paderborn, and revised and edited by the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J.—**The Other Life** (Herder: 18s. net)—may be warmly recommended to the clergy and educated laity. It will be of great use in the preparation of sermons and instructions. How often, when contemplating our own inevitable end, or following in memory those who are gone before, we ask wistfully for some fuller knowledge of the strange, mysterious state so jealously veiled off from the sphere of natural experience and knowledge! We know, indeed, all that we need to know, all that we need for faith, hope and the love of the Father who has prepared a place for His children. But in that knowledge of Faith more is implicitly contained than we commonly realize. To unfold that sublime and consoling content was the aim of Bishop Schneider in writing this book; to this task he devoted his great learning, eloquence and pastoral experience. He will be found a safe guide to-day when so many false teachers, pseudo-mystics, charlatans, or cranks, are leading the unwary into the deadly quicksands of spiritualism and theosophy.

### APOLOGETIC.

The sermons delivered by Cardinal Gasquet on the causes and consequences of the English Reformation have been reprinted in a neat shilling volume by the C.T.S., under the title **England's Breach with Rome**. Taking the four points—Papal Supremacy, the Mass, the Sacrificing Priesthood, and the independence of the Church—he shows clearly and succinctly how completely the reformers rejected them in the new Erastian religion they established by law.

### DEVOTIONAL.

The **Gathered Fragments** (Manresa Press: 3s. 6d. net) which Father de Zulueta has lately published refer very aptly to a collection he has made of the various writings on the subject of Frequent Communion, wherein he has amplified or illustrated or enforced what he has already devoted to the same great theme in many books. They were well worth collecting as representing the counsels and exhortations of a wise and experienced director.

The clear thinking and apt expression which we are now accustomed to look for in Abbot Vonier's devotional writings are in full evidence in his latest work, **The Christian Mind** (Herder: 5s. net), the object of which is to point out the full implications of Christianity. For this purpose, after taking our Lord's own utterances, he goes to St. Paul's inspired developments of them, showing how by means of a great variety of metaphor the Apostle insisted on one central idea of deep mystical significance, viz., that the Christian should live, not merely according to the external rule laid down by his faith, but with the very life of Christ Himself. Until he does so, until his centre of reference in all judgments, aims and choices is God and not self, he is not completely Christian, all his life does not flow from the Vine. The truth so presented is simple in conception but not easy to translate into effect: hence the Abbot labours, both to prove its central and essential character and to trace its various manifestations in practice. His plan necessitates copious quotations from St. Paul: we cannot but feel that his argument

would have gained in force and lucidity if he had avoided the frequent obscurities of the Rheims by quoting instead the new Westminster Version. He is keenly alive to the difficulties of the Apostle's style,—his "strange and quaint reasonings," "those rugged efforts of St. Paul's intellect"—and therefore should be glad to discard anything that adds to them. On one point only do we venture to dissent from the learned author. In chapter x. he seems to endorse the pessimistic, zeal-paralyzing theory of the fewness of the saved, and to imply that love of the whole human race is not necessarily a part of love of Christ. His authorities do not bear him out in this.

At a time when, with the encouragement of the Holy Father, the consecration of individual families to the Sacred Heart is being preached all over the world, Catholics will welcome the little treatise called **The Love of the Sacred Heart** (B.O. and W.: 6s. net), compiled from the writings of St. Margaret Mary and Blessed John Eudes, with explanatory comments. The anonymous French author sets forth the doctrine and practice of these two saints in regard to the various virtues and trials of the consecrated Christian life, and the whole forms a valuable guide and stimulus to perfection through charity.

The stories contained in Father Dreves' book, **A Joyful Herald of the King of Kings and Other Stories** (Sands: 3s. 6d. net), are not essays in fiction but narratives of real persons and occurrences, illustrating the workings of the Holy Spirit in the vocation to the missionary life. They make pleasant and edifying reading and should exercise in their measure a quiet but effective apostolate. *Quod isti, nonne ego?*

Deep and true piety and, in the main, sound spiritual doctrine characterize a little book, **He Led Captivity captive** (Heffer: 3s. net), by Dr. A. H. McNeile, of Trinity College, Dublin, the aim of which is to urge Christians to understand and practise their religion in all the details of common life.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL.

Our readers have already been made acquainted with the heroic death of four French nuns who perished under the Terror at Cambrai,<sup>1</sup> and were beatified last June. A fuller account of their holy lives and martyrdom may be read in **The Sisters of Charity martyred at Arras in 1914** (C.T.S.: 1s. net), abridged from the French by Alice, Lady Lovat. It is a pity that in the title *Arras* by mistake appears instead of *Cambrai*. The martyrs lived and served the poor at Arras but were taken to Cambrai to die.

Another martyr not yet beatified is the heroic Jesuit, Father John Ogilvie, one of the few Catholics put to death in Scotland for the Faith, but summing up, in the constancy he displayed under torture, the wit with which he baffled his accusers, the success with which he rebutted the charge of treason and showed that his persecution was *in odium fidei*, the most characteristic traits of his English colleagues. The authors of his life,—**A Scottish Knight-Errant** (B.O. and W.: 5s. net)—Madame Forbes and Miss M. Cahill, provide in their sketch of Scottish History at the Reformation a fitting background for their excellent study of his heroic career. The book is full of interest, both historical and religious, and those who accuse the Catholic Church of tyrannizing over consciences may read in this story details of Presbyterian intolerance which make legends about the Inquisition tame.

<sup>1</sup> "The Martyrs of Cambrai," by the Comtesse de Courson. **THE MONTH,** July, 1919.

## PHILOSOPHICAL.

A recently issued book—*Eléments de Philosophie. I. Introduction Générale* (Téqui: 5.00 fr.) par Jacques Maritain, professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris—provides another specimen of the admirable work being done at the Institut Catholique. It is not rash to say that for our generation the final decision must be fought out on the philosophic front, and we welcome the more cordially this last attempt to set forth those assured philosophical truths which are inseparable from the scientific study of the Faith. At the same time, it must be understood, as our author points out, that the "Christian Philosophy," Aristoteleanism, re-interpreted by St. Thomas, is not taught as a branch of Christian doctrine, but as an independent discipline demonstrably true. Its agreement with the Faith is not the source of its authority, but an extra-philosophic guarantee and corroboration of it. The author follows the more recent treatises on philosophy in putting Ontology after Psychology, and not in immediate succession to Logic. Metaphysics should not be the preliminary study, but the supreme goal of philosophy according to Aristotle and St. Thomas. It was the aprioristic method of Descartes (so the author thinks) which introduced the custom of putting the treatise on the nature of Being at the beginning of the course.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

We trust that all Catholics engaged in education see the little monthly magazine called *The Sower*, edited by Father F. H. Drinkwater, of Birmingham. It is engaged in the important, if delicate, work of teaching our teachers, *i.e.*, of keeping in view the true ideal of education and criticizing existing methods and practices in the light of that ideal. Catholics understand what education means much better than those not of the Faith; but all Catholics do not know how to apply their knowledge. Of all educational subjects that of religion is clearly the most important, and therefore we welcome, culled from the pages of *The Sower* and published at a shilling by the C.T.S., the Editor's reflections on *Religion in School*, wherein he deals very candidly with what he considers amiss in current theory and practice. Our readers are familiar with the controversy about methods of teaching religion which have had their echoes in our pages. Father Drinkwater's shrewd and mellow wisdom should hasten the day of reform.

In *Marriage and Motherhood* (B.O. and W.: 6s. net) Alice, Lady Lovat has produced a book which all true Eugenists should value exceedingly, and which, compared with the abominable writings of the pseudo-Eugenists, is like a bed of lilies alongside a heap of offal. For it develops the Catholic ideal of the marriage state as portrayed by the God who instituted it, and as raised by the alchemy of Christ's redemption to be a potent means of grace and sanctification. It is full of tender and practical wisdom, the fruit both of reading and experience, and it deals not only with the moral and spiritual side of its subject but with the physical. Much of the book is devoted to the training of children in body and in character, and the authoress is prolific in shrewd and helpful suggestions. No better antidote could be devised to the "eugenic" poison that pervades our modern press and literature, and every Catholic mother should welcome the book both for herself and her growing daughters.

The indispensable **Catholic Directory for 1921** (B.O. and W.: 3s. 6d. net) appears this year in its former serviceable binding but without the map of the provinces and dioceses of Catholic England which was of such interest to the traveller and holiday-maker, as also to those who, longing for the conversion of their country, found in it a ready indication of where conversion is most needed. The book as a whole shows not only what is being done but what remains to be done. The number of conversions is increasing, but only slowly, and is still a mere trickle compared with the population. We do not understand why the number of marriages (21,751) for 1919, given in the general statistics, p. 572, does not correspond with the number (19,078) given in the Registrar-General's returns. The total of marriages in the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, not included in the latter, cannot account for the difference. We need hardly repeat that this particular book of reference should take precedence of all others in every Catholic household.

It would seem that out of the Irish Catholic Truth Society's Annual Conference would spring, as has happened in this country, a National Catholic Congress. The project was, at any rate, mooted at the October Conference of the Society, and, as we gather from **The Torch** (C.T.S. of Ireland: 2s. 6d.), the large and admirably got up record of the proceedings, it was welcomed by the Cardinal Primate and other influential men. As the record indicates, Catholicity in Ireland has its own problems, in addition to those common to the Faith everywhere, and there is evident a strong and growing determination to take all necessary means to solve them as only Catholicity can. The apostolic work of the laity, both men and women, was strongly insisted upon, the need of co-operation and foresight, the cultivation of Sacred Art, the elimination of vice from literature and the press and the drama, the development, in a word, of a truly Catholic civilization in Ireland formed the burden of most of the papers and addresses. The whole atmosphere of the Conference, as preserved in its record, was one of hope and energy. We trust that, in spite of untoward political conditions, that energy will bring about the speedy fulfilment of that hope.

Mr. J. H. Thomas, the General Secretary of the N.U.R., issued a sort of a challenge to the existing social and economic order in his book *When Labour Rules*. The challenge has been taken up by Mr. E. Williams in a pamphlet called **The Red Light** (The Freedom Association: 2s. 6d.), a title strangely enough assumed by Mr. Thomas himself in a still later book on railway nationalization. Mr. Williams makes an effective reply to the many lapses in logic and the one-sided presentation of facts of which his somewhat rhetorical opponent is guilty, and his pamphlet forms a useful corrective to the Labour leader's partisan statement. But he is too much concerned with scoring points: he too writes as a partisan, for he ignores what no supporter of Capitalism should ever forget—the long years of callous exploitation and injustice to which working-folk were subject under that system, and to which, but for their own defensive organizations and the laws of the State they would be subject still. Like the cause of Ireland, with which also the author shows himself in imperfect sympathy, the state of Labour can only be rightly understood in the light of history, for the evil seed sown in the past is still bearing evil fruit. The same partisan spirit which so weakens the force of his criticism is seen in the way in which the author deals with

the Drink Trade, which, in spite of its anti-social character, he professes to reckon on a par with grocery and haberdashery.

The title of the National Congress Record, which appears as the C.S.G. Annual for 1921, is **Catholic Forces** (C.S.G., Oxford: 1s. 6d.). As we indicated its character and contents at some length in our last issue we need do no more than repeat our exhortation to all who are zealous for the Catholic cause to read and digest the information it contains, and to strive to carry out the ideals of co-operation and energetic propaganda which it puts forward.

#### MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

A little book with an ambitious title, **The Psalms Made Easy** (B.O. and W.: 3s.), is intended by Father Joseph Rickaby, the commentator, to make the recitation of the Daily Office more intelligible than it is apt to be, and to encourage the laity to use the Psalterium as a book of devotion. The explanations do not aim at restoring the original, often unascertainable, Hebrew meaning, but at making the sense of the Latin clear, although sometimes the original has to be called into aid.

The series of **Talks for the Little Ones**, by a Religious of the Holy Child, has been published in a single volume (C.T.S.: 1s. 6d. net). The somewhat vague title covers a number of colloquies with Christ and His Mother and the Angels framed in language suited to children, although at times the thoughts may be too grown-up for them. All may be obtained separately, price 2d. each. Father Ross's **Little Book on Purgatory** (C.T.S.: 2d.) appears in a second edition, and Father Thurston writes a sober yet telling examination of **Freemasonry** (C.T.S.: 2d.), which justifies the Holy See's action in its regard and shows how impossible it is to combine membership of the craft with Catholicity.

Religious instruction, whether of children or catechumens, will be rendered more easy and profitable by the use of **Scripture Examples** (B.O. and W.: 9d. each), compiled by the Sisters of Notre Dame. They are booklets explanatory of the Catechism, and further illustrated by incidents and doctrines narrated in the Bible.

The recent monthly publications of the "American Association for International Conciliation," October, November and December, 1920, contain nothing of abiding value except the Draft Scheme of the Permanent Court of International Justice, published, with comments, in December. Provided Justice takes the place of self-interest in the heart of each nation, it should work fairly well.

The cheap "Text for Students" series published by the S.P.C.K. include among recent issues the **Itinerarium Regis Ricardi** (1s. 9d. net), edited by M. T. Stead; **Select Extracts illustrating Florentine Life in the Fifteenth Century** (1s. net), edited by E. G. Roper, B.A.; and a similar selection by the same editor dealing with the Florentine Life in Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries (1s. net).

From Turin comes a fourth reissue of S. Marietti's well-known **Officium Majoris Hebdomadæ** (10.75 fr.), comprising the contents of the Breviary and Missal from Palm Sunday to Low Saturday, and brought into accord with the recent recension of the Missal; a very handy volume for those who wish to appreciate the beauty of the liturgy of this period.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

AMERICA PRESS, New York.

*The Catholic Mind*. Vol. XVIII.  
No. 24.

BEAUCHESNE, Paris.

*La Compagnie de Jésus : 1521—1773*.  
By J. Brucker, S.J. Pp. 840.  
Price, 12.00 fr.

BLACKWELL, Oxford.

*The Little Wings*. By Vivienne  
Dayrell. Pp. 80. Price, 5s. net.

BONNE PRESSE, Paris.

*Romans Populaires*. Nos. 92, 93.  
Price, 50 centimes each.

BROWNE & NOLAN, Dublin.

*St. Bernard's Sermons on the Canticle  
of Canticles*. Vol. II. Pp. viii.  
539. Price, 10s.

BURNS, OATES & WHARMBOURNE,  
London.

*The Psalms made Easy*. By Joseph  
Rickaby, S.J. Pp. ix. 106. Price,  
3s. net. *The Rule of St. Benedict*,  
By Dom Paul Delatte. Pp. xvi.  
508. Price, 21s. net. *Marriage  
and Motherhood*. By Alice, Lady  
Lovat. Pp. xxvii. 171. Price,  
6s. net. *The Love of the Sacred  
Heart*. Pp. xv. 191. Price, 6s.  
net. *Some Ethical Aspects of  
the Social Question*. By Rev. W.  
McDonald. Pp. viii. 218. Price,  
7s. 6d. net. *A String of Sapphires*.  
By Helen Parry Eden. Pp. xiii.  
173. Price, 10s. net.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD, Oxford.

*Catholic Forces*. Pp. 108. Price,  
1s. 6d.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.

*Religion in School*. By Rev. F. H.  
Drinkwater. Pp. 56. Price, 1s.  
net. *The Sisters of Charity Mar-  
tyred at Arras*. By Alice, Lady  
Lovat. Pp. 86. Price, 1s. net.  
*Talks for the Little Ones*. Pp. 196.  
Price, 1s. 6d. net. *Freemasonry*.  
By H. Thurston, S.J. Price,  
2d. *England's Breach with Rome*.  
By Cardinal Gasquet. Pp. 58.  
Price, 1s. net. Several Twopenny  
Pamphlets.

CHEVALIER & MORLAND, Amersham.

*When Two Hearts Are One: Gifts*.  
Songs composed by Russell  
Norrie. Price, 2s. net each.

LA VIE NOUVELLE, Montreal.

*Nos Voyageurs*. By E. Lecompte,  
S.J. Illustrated. Pp. 212. Price,  
\$1.25.

LETHIELLEUX, Paris.

*La Vertu de Force*. By Père Jan-  
vier. Pp. 356. Price, 8.00 fr.  
*Dans le Silence et dans la Prière*.  
By Abbé Ch. Cordonnier. Pp.  
284. Price, 4.00 fr. *Allons à  
Dieu*. By Y. D'Isné. Pp. viii.  
848. Price, 8.00 fr.

LONGMANS, London.

*Aspects of Christian Character*. By  
J. H. B. Masterman. Pp. x. 113.  
Price, 3s. 6d. net. *Divine En-  
dowment*. By Rev. J. Brett. Pp.  
vii. 12s. Price, 5s. net.

MANZ, Regensburg.

*Die Ethik des Aristoteles*. By Dr.  
M. Wittmann. Pp. xix. 355.  
Price, 18 marks.

MARIETTI, Turin.

*Liber Sacramentorum*. By Abbot J.  
Schuster. Vol. II. *L'Inaugurazione  
del Regno Messianico*. Pp.  
214. Price, 7.50 fr. Vol. III.  
*Il Testamento Nuovo nel Sangue  
del Redentore*. Pp. 250. Price,  
9.00 fr. *De Sacramentis*. Vol. I.  
By Felix Cappello, S.J. Pp.  
xxiii. 696. Price, 12.00 fr. *Offi-  
cium Majoris Hebdomadae*. Ed. 4<sup>th</sup>.  
Pp. 468. Price, 10.75 fr. (bound).

N.C.C.V.D., London.

*The Welfare Library: Seven Booklets  
on Social Subjects*. Price, 1s. 3d.

S.P.C.K., London.

*St. Bernard on Grace and Free-Will*.  
Edited by W. W. Williams, M.A.  
Pp. xxiii. 95. Price, 7s. 6d. net.

PERES BLANCS, Marseilles.

*Entre le Victoria, l'Albert, et l'Edouard*.  
By P. J. Gorju. With Maps  
and Illustrations. Pp. 372. Price,  
13.50 fr.

UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge.

*The Art of War in Italy, 1494—1529*.  
By F. L. Taylor. With Maps.  
Pp. 228. Price, 12s. 6d. net.

2